PUBLICATIONS OF THE CATHOLIC
HOMILETIC SOCIETY: NUMBER ONE

PROCEEDINGS OF

The Catholic Homiletic Society

CHARTER CONVENTION

1958-1962

NEW YORK CITY DEC. 28-30, 1958

Telegram Received at Opening
of the Convention

"On happy occasion of the Charter Convention of the Catholic Homiletic Society, Holy Father, Pope John XXIII, has graciously deigned to impart His Apostolic Benediction to the members of the society and all who take part in deliberations."

MONSIGNOR ACHILLE LUPI,
Charge D'Affaires

Contents

PAGE

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS 5

Formation of the Society 6

Constitution 11

Delegates to the Charter Convention 15

The Perennial Rhetoric as the Framework of Homiletic Theory
JOSEPH M. CONNORS, S.V.D. 20

Photograph of the General Luncheon 32, 33

Pastors After His Own Heart
JAMES MCVANN, C.S.P. 41

Contemporary Problems in Sunday Morning Preaching
THOMAS V. LISKE 51

Bibliography for Speech and Homiletics 58

NIHIL OBSTAT
JOHN MUSINSKY, S.V.D.
Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR
✠ ALBERT G. MEYER
Archbishop of Chicago
August 15, 1959

COPYRIGHT CATHOLIC HOMILETIC SOCIETY, 1959

The Catholic Homiletic Society

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PRESIDENT: Rev. Joseph M. Connors, S.V.D., Techny, Illinois

VICE-PRESIDENT: Rev. John J. O'Keefe, C.S.P., Washington, D. C.

SECRETARY: Rev. Declan Bailey, O.F.M., New York City, New York

TREASURER: Rev. Thomas D. Rover, O.P., Washington, D. C.

DIRECTORS FOR ONE YEAR:

Rev. Thomas V. Liske, Chicago, Illinois
Rev. James A. McVann, C.S.P., Washington, D. C.

DIRECTORS FOR TWO YEARS:

Rev. John Cassels, S.T.D., Darlington, New Jersey
Rev. Pius Leabel, C.P., Sierra Madre, California

DIRECTORS FOR THREE YEARS:

Rev. Joseph R. Maxwell, S.J., Lenox, Massachusetts
Rev. Thomas M. Landry, O.P., Quebec, Canada

COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS

Rev. Declan Bailey, O.F.M., (*Chairman ex officio*)
Rev. Joseph H. O'Neill, S.T.L., Beaverton, Ontario
Rev. Gilbert Zlatar, O.F.M., San Francisco, California

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

Rev. Sylvester MacNutt, O.P., River Forest, Illinois
Rev. Fidelis Rice, C.P., West Springfield, Massachusetts
Rev. Leo P. Wobido, S.J., St. Louis, Missouri

HEADQUARTERS

The Catholic Homiletic Society, Techny, Illinois

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Rev. Declan Bailey, O.F.M., 135 W. 31st Street, New York, N. Y.

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

Rev. Thomas Rover, O.P., 487 Michigan Ave. N.E., Washington 17, D. C.

The Formation of the Catholic Homiletic Society

When the Speech Association of America held its convention in the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago in December, 1956, many priests were among the delegates. They had come as individuals with a special interest in some aspect of the general field of speech. Most of them were teaching speech or homiletics in seminaries, and some were well-known to each other from previous meetings. Two of them[1] felt that they had problems which they could discuss more fruitfully among themselves than in the general sessions. They therefore invited the others to a group discussion. At the meeting at noon the next day, December 28, twelve priests were present.[2] They discussed their common interests and especially the need for better communication among themselves. It was finally decided to hold another meeting in Chicago the following year, in Christmas week of 1957, just prior to the next S.A.A. convention. The purpose would be to establish some kind of organization for priests interested in speech and homiletics, either within or outside of the S.A.A. Father Oscar J. Miller, C.M., of Perryville, Missouri, was entrusted with the organizational effort, and after giving their own addresses and the names of other priests in the work, the group adjourned.

During the following year there was no further activity among these priests, although more names were added to the mailing list. Then, early in December of 1957, Father Miller sent out notice of a one-day meeting to be held in Chicago at the end of the month. Of thirty-three replies, twenty-one said to postpone the meeting until the following convention of the Speech Association of America, and four others indicated the same opinion by telephone. This response, taken together with the shortness of notice and indefiniteness of program, and especially with the

[1]Rev. Joseph M. Connors, S.V.D., and Rev. John St. George, S.J.

[2]Rev. Gavin Barnes, O.S.B.; Rev. John Boyle, S.J.; Rev. Joseph M. Connors, S.V.D.; Rev. Jovian Lang, O.F.M.; Rev. Eric Lies, O.S.B.; Rev. John McHenry, S.V.D.; Rev. Oscar J. Miller, C.M.; Rev. Robert Pollauf, S.J.; Rev. Robert Purcell, S.J.; Rev. Walter Wilezek, C.R.; Rev. Wilfrid Wilhelm, O.F.M.Cap.

fact that the S.A.A. had already met elsewhere for that year, moved Father Miller to postpone the gathering until its success could be predicted with greater certainty.

In the meantime, interviews with homiletics professors in major seminaries along the Atlantic seaboard revealed, on the one hand, an almost total lack of communication among them, and, on the other hand, a great interest in any scheme for sharing ideas. On February 3, 1958, therefore, Father Joseph M. Connors, S.V.D., invited homiletics professors of the Washington area to an informal meeting at Divine Word College, Washington, D.C. Thirteen priests were present.[3]

This first meeting in the Washington area, which became the pattern of those to follow, was divided into two sections of about forty-five minutes each. The first section was dedicated to the discussion of how to achieve three particular aims: a way of sharing the most practical techniques of teaching homiletics in the seminary; stimulation of research in homiletics; and the generating of interest among educational administrators in the establishment of graduate departments of homiletics for the instruction and training of those who wish to specialize in homiletics beyond the usual seminary courses. The second section of the meeting was dedicated to a discussion of what was being done in homiletics courses in the various seminaries represented by the men at the meeting.

In the late winter and through the spring of 1958 five meetings of this type were held in the Washington area. In the second meeting, on February 17 at Holy Name College, the group adopted informally the title Catholic Homiletic Society, and established four committees: one to draw up a charter,[4] another to recruit members,[5] and a third to plan the discussion programs for the second part of each meeting,[6] and a fourth to publish a newsletter.[7] The third meeting was held on March 13 at Marist College, and was attended by about two dozen of the homiletics professors of the area. At the fourth meeting on April 17 at St. Paul's College, it was

[3]Invited to the meeting were Rev. Declan Bailey, O.F.M.; Rev. Chester C. Ball, S.S.J.; Rev. Edmond D. Benard; Rev. Lawrence Bunzel, S.V.D.; Rev. Fidelis Goodman, M.M.; Rev. Joseph Grispino, S.M.; Rev. Edward F. Hanahoe, S.A.; Rev. Frank Kelly, O.S.A.; Rev. Arthur Kiernan, M.M.; Rev. James T. McGuire, O.S.F.S.; Rev. Victor E. Mills, O.F.M.; Rev. John J. O'Keefe, C.S.P.; Rev. Regis O'Neil, C.S.C.: Rev. Armand Robichaud, S.M.; Rev. Thomas D. Rover, O.P.; Rev. Giles Staab, O.F.M.Cap. Of these, Fathers Ball, Benard, Hanahoe, Rover, and Staab found it impossible to be present at the first meeting, although they did intend to become part of the group.

[4]Rev. John O'Keefe, C.S.P.; Rev. Regis O'Neil, C.S.C.; Rev. Armand Robichaud, S.M.

[5]Rev. Frank Kelly, O.S.A., and Rev. Edward F. Hanahoe, S.A.

[6]Rev. Declan Bailey, O.F.M., and Rev. Thomas D. Rover, O.P.

[7]Rev. Joseph M. Connors, S.V.D., and Rev. John White, S.M.

decided to hold a general convention of priests from all geographical areas for the adoption of a charter and the definitive founding of the Catholic Homiletic Society. The fifth meeting on May 8 at the Dominican House of Studies fixed the time and place of the general convention: December 28-30, 1958, in New York City.

From this point onward a special committee took up the task of planning the charter convention. This committee was made up of those who had been carrying on the organizational work in the five local meetings. Father Joseph M. Connors, S.V.D., acted as chairman, and Father Declan Bailey, O.F.M., as secretary-treasurer. Father John O'Keefe, C.S.P., was charged with preparing the charter for discussion and adoption; Father Thomas D. Rover, O.P., was entrusted with public relations and news releases; Father Edmond D. Benard, of the Catholic University, was called upon, as one experienced with the formative periods of other academic and theological societies, to render his advice to the committee at every step in the planning.

In the fall of 1958 the preparations gathered momentum. The Newsletter, of which four dittographed and multilithed issues had appeared in February, March, April, and June, now began to appear in a new four-page format printed offset. Notice of the forthcoming convention was sent to all seminaries and all major religious superiors. In Newsletters published in October and December, the final details of the convention preparation were made known. In addition, notices were published in Catholic periodicals and a full-length article was printed in the December issue of *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review* analyzing the reasons for forming a Catholic Homiletic Society. Two more local meetings were held. On November 24, the group from the Washington area met again at the Capuchin College, and on November 28 twenty priests of the Chicago area met at Saint Mary's Mission Seminary, Techny, Illinois.

Through these media the plan of organizing a homiletic society had been made known to most of the homiletics professors in the United States and Canada. The great interest shown by these men seemed to augur well for the future of a society organized for the exchange of information concerning homiletic theory and training in the seminaries. At the same time, however, a number of speech teachers in minor seminaries had expressed doubts about their place in a homiletic society, and many missioners and parish priests and directors of retreat houses had inquired whether the proposed society would have to be exclusively an academic one. It was becoming clear that a full discussion of the exact scope and purpose of the society would be of the greatest importance in the adoption of the constitution at the charter convention.

When the convention met in New York on December 28-30, seventy delegates were in attendance. As the list printed elsewhere in these *Proceedings* indicates, they came from all geographical areas and constituted a fairly general representation of the homiletic field. On Sunday afternoon, the first day of the convention, Father John J. O'Keefe, C.S.P., as the committee-member responsible for the tentative draft of the constitution, presided over a three-hour meeting in which each article of the constitution was thoroughly discussed in preparation for its adoption the following Tuesday morning. Thirty-five of the seventy delegates had arrived in time to participate in this discussion, and by the end of the three hours they seemed to feel that they had discussed and amended all the provisions to their satisfaction.

The discussion clearly revealed that in the months which had passed since the idea of a Catholic Homiletic Society had first been broached, some development had taken place in the idea itself. The earliest meetings had been among men who were almost all teaching homiletics in major seminaries, and their concern was almost exclusively with their courses and the research to be done and the graduate training to be provided. Entering into the picture since that time, however, had been parish priests primarily concerned with self-improvement, directors of mission bands and retreat houses, teachers of speech in minor seminaries, seminarians themselves, and lay persons whose particular circumstances brought them very close to the training of future preachers or to some other part of the broad field of homiletics.

The delgates decided to welcome this development of interest as providential, and to broaden the scope of the proposed society to enable it to serve a larger mission than the academic one first envisioned. They decided that the projects and activities of the society should be of service to preachers now active in the pulpits in all forms of the ministry of the word, and to those who are laying the foundation of later training in homiletics by teaching speech in the minor seminaries and novitiates, and to those who in a great variety of other ways are concerned with the most effective preaching of Catholic doctrine. In this tenor, the first article of the proposed constitution was revised to read: "The primary purposes of this Society shall be to assist priests in the most effective preaching of the word of God in all fields of the sacred ministry, to promote by organized effort practical techniques in the teaching of homiletics, and to encourage research and publication in homiletic theory and practice." At the same time, the interests of seminarians and lay people were provided for by establishing an associate as well as an active membership, as explained in the second article of the constitution.

The next day of the convention was given to papers and special-interest meetings. The three major papers read on Monday are published in these *Proceedings.* The special-interest meetings on Monday evening were on "physical aids in teaching homiletics" and "remedial speech work in the seminary." At the general luncheon, a picture of which appears in the *Proceedings,* the Most Reverend John T. Fearns, Auxiliary Bishop of New York, who was in attendance as the personal delegate of His Eminence, Cardinal Spellman, addressed the convention on the place of homiletics in the seminary curriculum, the need for trained teachers in the branch, and the general service which the Society could render in the improvement of Catholic preaching.

In the final session of the convention on Tuesday morning, some additional amendments were made to the draft of the constitution, after which it was adopted unanimously. Immediately afterward, Father Edmond D. Benard presented the recommendations of a nominating committee for the election of officers and called for further nominations from the floor. The final results of the elections appear in the list of officers and directors in these *Proceedings.* Since many priests had wished to attend the convention but found it impossible, and since some of these had been actively interested for many months in the projected society, the delegates then resolved that all who joined the society before May thirtieth, 1959, would be known as charter members. Resolutions were also passed expressing gratitude for the hospitality of the Archdiocese of New York, and extending Honorary Membership in the Society to His Eminence, Cardinal Spellman, and to His Excellency, Bishop Fearns. Above all, a resolution was passed of filial reverence and loyalty to His Holiness, Pope John XXIII, who in a cablegram through the Apostolic Delegation in Washington received at the opening of the convention had "graciously deigned to impart his Apostolic Benediction to the members of the Society and all who take part in deliberations."

JOSEPH M. CONNORS, S.V.D.

Constitution of the Catholic Homiletic Society

ARTICLE I: NAME AND PURPOSE

This association shall be called The Catholic Homiletic Society. The primary purposes of this Society shall be to assist priests in all fields of the sacred ministry in the most effective preaching of the word of God, to promote by organized effort practical techniques in the teaching of Homiletics, and to encourage research and publication in homiletic theory and practice.

ARTICLE II: MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Membership shall consist of active members and associate members.

a) Active members shall be entitled to vote in elections and hold office in the Society. Active membership shall be open to all priests.

b) Associate members shall be entitled to attend the meetings and receive the publications of the Society. Associate membership shall be open to all persons who identify themselves with the aims of the Society.

Section 2. Election to active and associate membership shall be by vote of the Committee on Admissions.

Section 3. The annual dues for active members shall be ten dollars. The annual dues for associate members shall be five dollars.

Section 4. Any member who shall fail to pay his dues for the period of two consecutive years shall be liable to forfeiture of membership. Forfeiture of membership may also occur in accord with the provision of the Canons of the Code.

ARTICLE III: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 1. The Society shall be governed by the Board of Directors. The Board shall consist of ten members, including the Officers of the Society.

Section 2. The Board shall meet for the transaction of business at such times and places as shall be designated by the president, provided his call gives fifteen days' notice and specifies the nature of the business to be treated.

Section 3. A quorum of this Board shall consist of five members of the Board, provided that at least three of the five shall be directors other than Officers.

Section 4. If any vacancy shall occur in the Board of Directors by reason of death, resignation accepted by the Board, or otherwise, such vacancy may be filled by a majority vote of the remaining members of the Board. Any such vacancy may also be filled by members entitled to vote at any formal meeting of the Society held during the existence of such vacancy, provided that the notice of such meeting shall have mentioned such vacancy.

ARTICLE IV: DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1. The Officers shall consist of a President, a Vice President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer. This shall be the order of succession of officers in case of absence or disability.

Section 2. The President shall preside at meetings of the Society and of the Board of Directors. He shall have power, when authorized by the Board of Directors, to enter into contracts on behalf of the Society. He shall make a report of the activities of the Society at the annual meeting.

Section 3. The Vice-President, at the request of the President, or in the event of the absence or disability of the same, shall perform the duties of the office of President.

Section 4. The Secretary shall in general perform all duties incident to the office of the Secretary. In particular he shall:

a) keep the minutes of the meetings of the Society, and cause the same to be recorded in books provided for the purpose, which shall be at reasonable times open to the inspection of the members of the Society;

b) keep the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Directors;

c) keep a roll of members, a copy of which he shall certify to the Inspectors of elections at the annual meeting;

d) see that all notices are given as required by the Constitutions or by the sacred canons;

e) be the custodian of the records of the Society as well as of the official seal thereof;

f) conduct the ordinary correspondence of the Society;

g) be ex officio a member of the Committee on Admissions, and act as its secretary.

Section 5. The Treasurer shall:

a) receive all moneys and other property paid to the Society;

b) cause all moneys and other valuable effects to be deposited in

the name and to the credit of the Society, in such banks or trust companies as shall be selected by the Board of Directors;

c) make all disbursements authorized by the Board of Directors;

d) cause to be taken and preserved proper vouchers for all moneys disbursed, these vouchers to be forwarded to the Secretary;

e) keep the accounts in books belonging to the Society, which shall at all times be open to the inspection of the Board of Directors, to whom he shall, whenever requested, make reports in writing of the money received and paid out of the funds in hand;

f) at the annual meeting make a full written report of the receipts and disbursements of the year;

g) send out a notice to the members one month in advance that their dues are payable;

h) have the right, and is hereby empowered, from time to time to require from the officers or agents of the Society reports or statements giving such information as he may desire with respect to any and all financial transactions of the Society.

ARTICLE V: ELECTIONS

Section 1. All officers and directors shall be elected by a majority of the votes validly cast, provided, however, that if no candidate receives a majority vote after three ballots have been taken, the candidate who receives the highest number of votes in the third ballot shall be considered elected. In case of a tie after the third ballot, the senior by ordination shall be considered elected.

Section 2. Officers shall be elected for a term of one year and may be re-elected, except that no President shall serve more than two consecutive terms. Directors other than officers, two of whom shall be elected at each annual meeting, shall be elected for a term of three years. However, at the first annual meeting, following the adoption of these Constitutions, six directors other than officers shall be elected, two of whom shall be designated for a term of one year, two for a term of two years, and two for a term of three years.

Section 3. By a majority vote, the Board of Directors in office immediately following the adoption of these Constitutions shall elect a Nominating Committee consisting of three members, one for a term of one year, one for a term of two years, and one for a term of three years. Thereafter, the Board of Directors shall, by majority vote, fill any vacancy on such committee whether by expiration of term of office, resignation, or otherwise, provided that no member of this committee shall be eligible to succeed himself.

Except as otherwise stated above, the term of each member of this committee shall be three years. This committee shall make nominations for all elective officers as provided in the Constitutions. However, nominations from the floor shall have equal standing.

ARTICLE VI: MEETINGS

Section 1. The Society shall have at least one meeting each year at a time and place to be designated by the Board of Directors. All members may attend the meetings.

Section 2. Notice of the annual meeting shall be given at least one month in advance thereof, signed by the Secretary. This notice shall contain a statement of the agenda, together with a designation of the day, hour, and place of meeting.

Section 3. One-fifth of the total active membership shall constitute a quorum of any meeting of the Society.

ARTICLE VII: COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS

The Committee on Admissions shall consist of the Secretary of the Society and two other members who are not on the Board of Directors. The members other than the Secretary shall be appointed by the President for a term of two years. This committee shall determine the conditions of membership, examine the qualifications of the candidates, and recommend qualified candidates for approval by the members at the annual meeting.

ARTICLE VIII: COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

The Committee on Research and Publications, consisting of three members, shall be appointed by the President. This committee shall be empowered to facilitate research in Homiletics among the members and shall have charge of such publications as shall be authorized by the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE IX: AMENDMENTS

These Constitutions may be amended at any annual meeting by a two-thirds affirmative vote of the active members present, provided notice of such proposed amendment, with copy thereof, shall have been mailed to the entire active membership not less than one month in advance of such meeting. An Article of the Constitution may be suspended temporarily until the following meeting of the Society by a two-thirds affirmative vote of the Board of Directors.

Section 1. The following shall be the regular order of the business at the annual meeting of the Society:

1. Opening Prayer
2. Reading of the minutes
3. Presentation and discussion of papers
4. Committee Reports
5. Officers' Reports
6. Election of Officers and Directors
7. Closing Prayer

Section 2. The STURGIS STANDARD CODE OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE shall govern the deliberations of this Society in all cases where it does not conflict with the standing rule of this Society or with the Code of Canon Law. But any rule of Order may be suspended temporarily by a majority vote of the members present.

Delegates to the Charter Convention

MOST REV. JOHN T. FEARNS, *Auxiliary Bishop of New York*

REV. DECLAN BAILEY, O.F.M.
St. Francis Church, 135 W. 31st Street, New York 1, N.Y.

REV. EDMOND D. BENARD, S.T.D.
Catholic University of America, Brookland, D.C.

REV. ANTHONY D. BOTTI, S.J.
St. Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, New York

REV. WILLIAM BOW, *Glenmary Missionary*
Sacred Heart Church, Russellville, Kentucky

REV. JOHN BOYLE, S.J.
Bellarmine College, Plattsburgh, New York

REV. MEL BRADY, O.F.M.
Duns Scotus College, 9 Mile and Evergreen Roads,
Detroit 41, Michigan

REV. JOHN P. BRUNI, M.S.C.
Sacred Heart Seminary, Shelby, Ohio

REV. GABRIEL BUESCHER, O.F.M.
St. Leonard College, 8100 Clyo Road, Dayton 59, Ohio

REV. FRANK CALKINS, O.S.M.
Stonebridge Priory, Lake Bluff, Illinois

REV. JOHN D. CALLAHAN, S.T.D.
St. John's Seminary, Lake Street, Brighton, Massachusetts

REV. JOHN J. CASSELS
Immaculate Conception Seminary, (Darlington),
Ramsey, New Jersey

REV. CHARLES CONNORS, C.S.SP.
St. Mary's Seminary, Norwalk, Connecticut

REV. JOSEPH M. CONNORS, S.V.D.
St. Mary's Seminary, Techny, Illinois

REV. THOMAS W. COYLE, C.SS.R
Immaculate Conception College, Oconomowoc, Wisconsin

REV. FRANCIS X. CURRAN, S.J.
Shadowbrook, Lenox, Massachusetts

REV. WILLIAM DILGEN, S.M.M.
Provincial Headquarters, Ozone Park 16, New York

REV. REGINALD DUMAS, O.P.
5375 av. Notre Dame de Grace, Montreal 28, P.Q., Canada

REV. DANIEL DURKEN, O.S.B.
St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minnesota

REV. WILLIAM A. FABER, O.F.M.
St. Francis Church, 1615 Vine Street, Cincinnati 10, Ohio

REV. CHARLES FAIVRE, C.M.
St. Vincent's Seminary, 500 E. Chelten Avenue,
Philadelphia 44, Pennsylvania

REV. MATTHIAS FEIT, C.SS.R.
St. Joseph's College, Edgerton, Wisconsin

REV. WALTER FLAHERTY
(St. John's Seminary, Brighton), 75 Union Park Street,
Boston, Massachusetts

REV. LEO GAULRAPP, C.PP.S.
St. Charles Seminary, Carthagena, Ohio

REV. FRANCIS GERRY, S.V.D.
2907 Ellicott Terrace, N.W., Washington 8, D.C.

REV. FIDELIS GOODMAN, M.M.
Maryknoll Seminary, Maryknoll, New York

REV. JOHN J. HALLORAN, S.J.
St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas

REV. EDWARD A. HANAHOE, S.A.
Graymoor, Garrison, New York

VERY REV. ROBERT C. HUNTER, S.V.D.
St. Augustine Seminary, Bay St. Louis, Mississippi

REV. FRANCIS X. KELLY, O.S.A.
Augustinian College, 4330 Harewood Road, Washington, D.C.

REV. CHARLES F. KELTY, S.V.D.
St. Mary's Seminary, Techny, Illinois

REV. PETER KENNEY, S.S.J.
St. Joseph Seminary, Washington, D.C.

REV. THOMAS M. LANDRY, O.P.
Ecole de Pastorale et de Prédication, 175 Grande-Allée ouest,
Québec 6, Canada

REV. JOSEPH LARKIN, S.J.
Weston College, Weston, Massachusetts

REV. PIUS LEABEL, C.P.
Mater Dolorosa Monastery, 700 North Sunnyside Avenue
Sierra Madre, California

REV. ERIC LIES, O.S.B.
St. Meinrad Archabbey, St. Meinrad, Indiana

REV. EUGENE LINEHAN, S.J.
Woodstock College, Woodstock, Maryland

REV. THOMAS V. LISKE, *Pastor*
St. John Berchman's Church, 2517 Logan Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois

REV. SYLVESTER MACNUTT, O.P.
St. Rose Priory, Dubuque, Iowa

REV. FELICIAN MADIGAN, O.F.M. CONV.
St. Anthony-on-Hudson, Rensselaer, New York

REV. JOSEPH R. MAXWELL, S.J.
Shadowbrook, Lenox, Massachusetts

REV. EDWARD McGUINN, S.V.D.
Divine Word Seminary, Park Street, Bordentown, New Jersey

REV. JAMES McGUIRE, O.S.F.S.
De Sales Halle, 5301 Sargent Road, Hyattsville, Maryland

REV. JAMES McVANN, C.S.P.
St. Paul's College, 4th and Lincoln Road, N.E.
Washington 17, D.C.

REV. CYRIL F. MEYER, C.M.
Mary Immaculate Seminary, Northampton, Pennsylvania

REV. GREGORY MILLER, O.C.D.
514 Warren Street, Brookline 46, Massachusetts

REV. NORBERT MILLER, O.F.M. CAP.
Capuchin College, 4121 Harewood Road, N.E.
Washington 17, D.C.

REV. OSCAR J. MILLER, C.M.
St. Mary's Seminary, Perryville, Missouri

REV. VICTOR MILLS, O.F.M.
Holy Name College, 14th and Shepherd Streets, N.E.,
Washington 17, D.C.

REV. FINIAN MURPHY, M.S.SS.T.
Holy Trinity Mission Seminary, Winchester, Virginia

REV. CAMILLUS MURRAY, O.F.M. CONV.
Immaculate Conception Parish, 540 Chestnut Avenue,
Trenton, New Jersey

REV. JOHN O'CONNOR, S.C.J.
Sacred Heart Monastery, Hales Corners, Wisconsin

REV. OWEN O'CONNOR, O.P.
Dominican House of Studies, 487 Michigan Avenue, N.E.,
Washington 17, D.C.

REV. THOMAS O'FLAHERTY, S.M.A.
Queen of Apostles Seminary, Dedham, Massachusetts

REV. JOHN J. O'KEEFE, C.S.P.
St. Paul's College, 7th and Hamlin Streets,
Washington 17, D.C.

REV. REGIS O'NEIL, C.S.C.
Holy Cross College, 4001 Harewood Road, N.E.,
Washington 17, D.C.

REV. JOSEPH H. O'NEILL
St. Joseph's Church, Beaverton, Ontario, Canada

REV. ANTHONY PETERMAN, S.J.
West Baden College, West Baden Springs, Indiana

REV. ERVIN J. RAUSCH, O.S.C.
Crosier House of Studies, Route 1, Wallen Road,
Fort Wayne, Indiana

REV. FIDELIS RICE, C.P.
Passionist Monastery, West Springfield, Massachusetts

REV. EUGENE F. RICHARD
St. Joseph Seminary (Dunwoodie), Yonkers, New York

REV. THOMAS D. ROVER, O.P.
Dominican House of Studies, 487 Michigan Avenue, N.E.,
Washington 17, D.C.

REV. STEPHEN ROWE, O.F.M. CAP.
Capuchin College, 4121 Harewood Road, N.E.,
Washington 17, D.C.

REV. GERMAIN SCHWAB, O.F.M.
St. Joseph's Seminary, Teutopolis, Illinois

REV. ERMIN SMITH, O.S.B.
St. Vincent's Seminary, Latrobe, Pennsylvania

REV. STEPHEN STAED, O.S.B.
Conception Seminary, Conception, Missouri

REV. WILLIAM K. TRIVETT, S.J.
Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, New York

REV. WILFRED WILHELM, O.F.M. CAP.
St. Fidelis Seminary, Herman, Pennsylvania

REV. LEO WOBIDO, S.J.
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri

REV. GILBERT ZLATAR, O.F.M.
St. Boniface Church, San Francisco, California

The Perennial Rhetoric as the Framework of Homiletic Theory

The theme of this paper is that our homiletic theory and training will profit greatly from a thorough study of our long tradition and, more particularly, from a study of those works in our tradition which have been based upon certain rhetorical concepts and principles which have stood the test of the ages. I think that this main proposition can be established best in three stages, by showing:
(1) that there is a distinctly recognizable and definable body of rhetorical theory which may be justly called the perennial rhetoric;
(2) that this perennial rhetoric has been taken in the past as the framework of homiletic theory and training; and
(3) that a renewed study of this perennial rhetoric and of the manner in which it has been adapted to homiletics in the past will be of the utmost value at the present time. Before taking up each of these three parts of the general proposition, however, it seems essential here to define the terms which will be employed over and over again in this discussion. We must define the word *rhetoric,* the phrase *perennial rhetoric,* and the terms *framework* and *homiletic theory.*

Rhetoric itself has been traditionally defined as "the art of discovering in the given situation the available means of persuasion."[1] In its classic meaning the word has none of the pejorative connotations with which we now sometimes hear it invested when 'rhetoric' is set in false opposition to substance and solid content. Only in a very secondary and almost accidental way does rhetoric have to do with esthetic effect or ornamentation. Its first and essential office is to give effectiveness to the truth. Once the truth is established by careful investigation, it becomes the task of rhetoric to energize it, to state it so clearly and cogently and appealingly that it will be accepted and loved and acted upon for its own

[1]Aristotle *Rhetoric* i.1.

sake. To achieve this end, rhetoric makes a study of a particular truth in all its aspects, of the audience to which this truth must be presented, and of all the circumstances of the presentation, endeavoring to find the most effective formula for presenting this specific truth to this particular audience in these definite circumstances. It is in this classic sense that we understand rhetoric, taking it to stand for the science and art of giving effectiveness to the truth.[2]

With the term *perennial rhetoric,* we have been prepared by our training in scholastic philosophy to be familiar. Rhetoric may be called perennial in several senses, just as we speak of the perennial philosophy. We speak, for example, of the *philosophia perennis* in the sense that philosophy is engaged in a task which will never end, the project of analyzing the ulimates of reality, which is an effort that must go on as long as there are human beings confronted wih the profound mystery of their own existence and the vast and awesome universe in which they find themselves. In this sense we might also speak, if we wished, of a perennial rhetoric, since the effort of man to find in a given situation the available means of persuading his fellows will go on as long as the human race endures.

In a second sense, however, which is a more pertinent one in our present discussion, we speak of the philosophia perennis as a body of basic concepts and fundamental principles, discovered by the great minds of many ages, which form a deposit of well-established philosophical thought, and which any modern philosopher neglects only at his own

[2]Whether to call rhetoric a science or an art is a thorny question. The ancient rhetoricians already had trouble with it. Cf. Richard Volkmann, *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer,* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1885), pp. 2-16. And even though they often called it an art, they sometimes called the same things, such as medicine, an art in one passage and a science in another. As Werner Jaeger comments in his *Aristotle,* (2d. ed. rev.; Oxford: U. Press, 1948). p. 262, n. 3, "The Greeks called the sciences 'arts' because they never for an instant lost sight of the cultural products of theoretical activity. Art or τέχνη really includes both the whole content of the theoretical knowledge and the power that makes this knowledge fruitful in life." The whole question is matter for a thorough study, of which this writer thinks the conclusion will be a compromise such as that given by John Franklin Genung, *Working Principles of Rhetoric,* (Boston: Ginn, 1900), pp. 4-5: "Rhetoric, here called an art, is sometimes defined as a science. Both designations are true; they merely regard the subject in two different aspects. Science is systematized knowledge; if then the laws and principles of discourse are exhibited in an ordered and interrelated system, they appear in the character of a science. Art is knowledge made efficient by skill; if then rhetorical laws and principles are applied in the actual construction of discourse, they become the working-rules of an art." — One might be inclined to write this question off as a quibble over a word, except that preaching itself is sometimes so loosely called an art that the expression improperly implies a denial that there are systematic principles that govern its success. Stressing the scientific nature of homiletics should counteract this tendency.

great peril.[3] In this second sense also we may speak of a *rhetorica perennis*, and it is this meaning of the term which I should like to employ in this discussion. By the perennial rhetoric, therefore, I mean *an array of concepts and established principles which are perpetually valid because they reflect unchanging realities in human nature.* The given situation in which the rhetorician seeks the available means of persuasion may change superficially from age to age, but the components of human nature which are the essential elements of the rhetorical situation remain constant, and so do the rhetorical concepts and principles based on them.

The third term which needs definition prior to discussion is the word *framework*, since the proposition is that the perennial rhetoric must become the framework of homiletic theory. It would not be as good to use the word foundation, and perhaps it would be better to use the word scaffolding. Whichever term is used, the point to be made is that homiletics does not draw its strength and effectiveness from profane rhetoric, but from the divine commission to preach the word of God, and the divine grace which attends the duly commissioned preacher in the fulfillment of his office. To create here the impression that rhetoric is the foundation of homiletics would be to give further currency to a misconception which is already doing harm in our seminaries: namely, the erroneous notion that a training in public speaking is a training for preaching, or that homiletics is merely sacred rhetoric. Rather than open up this whole question here, which has been thoroughly analyzed elsewhere,[4] we can be content to say that the relation of rhetoric to homiletics is very similar to the relation of philosophy to theology. They are independent of each other and yet are of the greatest mutual assistance. They are so distinct that no one would mistake training in philosophy for a training in theology. The one prepares and facilitates the other, but it is far from being able to supply for it. Theology is autonomous and independent, having its origin and sources in divine revelation and its guidance in the magisterium, and

[3]Cf. Gerard Esser, S.V.D., *Logica*, (Techny, Ill.: Mission Press, 1942), p. 231, "Ipsa [philosophia] est perennis, quia quasdam continet *veritates* penitus et *in perpetuum stabilitas*, quae inde ab antiquis temporibus evidenter statutae et per aetates subsequentes confirmatae magisque complete elaboratae sunt; hae recte judicantur esse fructus duraturi intellectus humani." Cf. also Etienne Gilson, *God and Philosophy*, (New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1941), pp. xiv-xv, "The chaotic condition of contemporary philosophy, with the ensuing moral, social, political, and pedagogical chaos, is not due to any lack of philosophical insight among modern thinkers; it simply follows from the fact, that we have lost our way because we have lost the knowledge of some fundamental principles which, since they are true, are the only ones on which, today as well as in Plato's day, any philosophical knowledge worthy of the name can possibly be established."

[4]Cf. [Bishop] Von Keppler, "Homiletik," *Kirchenlexicon*, ed. Franz Kaulen, VI, 210, iv.

yet it receives immeasurable benefit from discussion of its own material in a framework of precise philosophical concepts and principles.

It would be one thing, and very false, to say that Catholic doctrine is derived from scholastic philosophy; it is quite another thing, and quite true, to say, as the late Pope Pius XII so clearly said in *Humani Generis,* that Catholic doctrine is discussed with great profit and systematized in a wonderful manner in the terms of scholastic philosophy.[5] We can, therefore, express what we mean by the term *framework* in our proposition that the perennial rhetoric must become the framework of homiletic theory by saying that what the concepts and principles of scholastic philosophy are to Catholic theology, that we would wish to see the perennial rhetoric become with regard to homiletics. The precision and stability and clarity which other theological disciplines enjoy by having adopted the terminology and principles of scholastic philosophy as a framework of discussion can be enjoyed also by homiletics if we will adopt the terminology and principles of the perennial rhetoric.

The fourth and final term to be defined is *homiletic theory.* By homiletic theory I do not mean something divorced from homiletic practice and homiletic training. No such divorce is possible, because there is nothing more practical than a good theory, and there is nothing less practical than much practice with no proper theory to guide it. Practice is simply the reflection of theory. We might as well set about building houses without blueprints or performing surgical operations without a knowledge of anatomy as set about assigning and hearing and criticizing practice sermons from student preachers without both teacher and student having a very sound and thorough grounding in the theory of what should go into a sermon, how it should be organized, how worded and phrased, and how, finally, delivered. When I speak, therefore, of homiletic theory, I include all that goes with it: the practice preaching in the seminaries, the evaluation of sermons given by the junior clergy, the discussion of methods and means among those actually engaged in one or the other form of preaching, whether it be Sunday morning instructions or days of recollection or retreats and missions — in fact, all aspects of homiletic activity as the science and art of preaching.

Now, then, we have our terms. By rhetoric I mean the science and art of discovering in a given situation the available means of persuasion; by the perennial rhetoric I mean that deposit of concepts and principles and that classification of them which has been handed down through the ages in the major works of rhetorical theory; by a framework I do not mean a foundation, since homiletics is fully independent of secular

[5] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XLII, (1950), pp. 561-578.

rhetoric in its origin and in its materials and in its goal, but a kind of scaffolding which enables us to build within it a structure which will eventually stand independent of it; by homiletic theory I mean more than idle speculation, I mean theory which is the soul of practice, or which governs practical action just as our heads govern our hands. Having these terms clear, let us see if we have a right to join them in the proposition that the perennial rhetoric must be made the framework of homiletic theory, and having already stated at the outset that this proposition can best be established in three stages, let us see if we can establish the first part of it: namely, that there is a distinctly recognizable and roughly definable body of rhetorical theory which may justly be called the perennial rhetoric.

Even *a priori* we should judge this statement to be true. For two thousand years and more, rhetoric was the staple of education in the western world. The educated man of ancient Greece and Rome was of necessity a master of rhetorical theory. The greatest minds of antiquity were occupied with it, Plato and Aristotle standing for a philosophical rhetoric whose sole purpose was to energize the truth and give it the power to penetrate men's minds and hearts, Cicero and Quintilian endeavoring to bring the speculations of Greek rhetoricians to Rome and put upon them the stamp of the practical Roman genius.[6] The Fathers of the fourth century in both East and West were essentially Christian rhetoricians. It would be superfluous to go on. The fact is that rhetoric was the staple of instruction and education in ancient times, and flourished up to the beginning of the Middle Ages, during which it continued to be an essential part of the curriculum, even if in a decadent form.[7] Again, rhetoric was central in the literary revival of the Renaissance, the rhetor of ancient Greece and Rome finding his counterpart in the humanist of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and the great Council of Trent being a gathering of prelates and theologians who counted among their number some of the most outstanding humanists, or rhetoricians, of their times.

Now it would be a truly amazing phenomenon if the accumulated thought and experience of centuries during which rhetorical theory was the object of the greatest effort of the most penetrating minds did not produce a body of theory which will make a fruitful study for those like ourselves, who in the art and science of energizing the truth must make every effort to use our knowledge of the nature of persuasion as

[6]Cf. Charles Sears Baldwin, *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic*, (New York: Macmillan, 1924), pp. vii, 5.

[7]Cf. Paul Abelson, *The Seven Liberal Arts*, No. 11 of *Columbia U. Teachers College Contributions to Education*, (New York: Columbia U. Press, 1906), ch. v, pp. 52-89. But see also Harry S. Caplan, "Classical Rhetoric and the Medieval Theory of Preaching," *Classical Philology*, XXVIII, (April, 1933), pp. 73-96.

a vehicle for divine grace. Even on the face of it, without further investigation, one would certainly be inclined to think that the efforts of two thousand years must have produced some body of rhetorical theory which we cannot ignore except at our own great peril.

Passing from the presumptions to facts, we can give an outline of the perennial rhetoric, based on features common in standard rhetorical works from the time of Aristotle until the late eighteenth century. The first feature is the division of rhetorical theory into five parts: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. Not only convention, but the very nature of the rhetorical situation, underlies such a division. As Cicero expressed it, "all the business of an orator is divided into five parts: he ought first to find out what he should say; next, to dispose and arrange his matter, not only in a certain order, but with a sort of power and judgment; then to clothe and deck his thoughts with language; then to secure them in his memory; and lastly to deliver them with dignity and grace." [8] The weakest of the five tracts was always the fourth, on memory, and, since it eventually disappeared from the fivefold canon, we can limit ourselves to a closer description of the remaining four tracts of the perennial rhetoric: namely, invention, arrangement, style and delivery.

The tract on invention is concerned with finding what is to be said. It is a matter of searching out the material, sifting it, rejecting what is less suitable, and finally selecting the components of the discourse. In this activity the perennial rhetoric guides the speaker by first distinguishing three purposes of rhetoric: *docere, delectare, movere* — or: to instruct, to inspire, and to get action. [9] Although these three aims may all be present in a given discourse, one aim should predominate, and the selection of material must be made accordingly, a different type of material being chosen for instruction than for inspiration or for movement to action. In achieving any one of these three aims, the perennial rhetoric will discuss the relative effect of each of the three modes of persuasion: *ethos, logos,* and *pathos* — or: the effect of the speaker's personal qualities, the effect of arguments drawn from the subject of discourse itself, and the effect of arguments based upon the psychological make-up of the audience. [10] The discussion of *ethos,* or the persuasive effect of the speaker's personal qualities, will go into aspects of what we would now call psychological sugges-

[8]Cicero *De Oratore* i.31.

[9]Cf. Cicero *Orator* 21.69; *De Oratore* ii.27.115; 28.121; 77.310. St. Augustine *De Doctrina Christiana* iv.12.27.

[10]Aristotle *Rhetoric* i.2. "Of the means of persuasion supplied by the speech itself there are three kinds. The first kind [ethos] reside in the character of the speaker; the second [pathos] consist in producing a certain attitude in the hearer; the third [logos] pertain to the argument proper, in so far as it actually or seemingly demonstrates."

tion, or the various overt and covert indications which the speaker gives his listeners, in the very act of speaking, of his personal competence, confidence, and good will.

The discussion of *logos,* or the intrinsic merits of the case, will take the speaker into an examination of the *topoi,* which are sources of material for discourse. They are distinguished into the general *topoi,* or talking points which are fertile sources for invention of material on all subjects, and special *topoi,* which are talking points only for subjects of a particular kind. They are distinguished again into the non-technical and the technical *topoi,* or, to use other terms for the same distinction, into material and formal *topoi.*[11] The material sources of information for a discourse are the books and brochures on the subject, articles and speeches and conversations and all other depositories of information and illustrations and other grist for the rhetorical mill. These material *topoi* will naturally differ from subject to subject, and the mastery of them will involve a kind of methodology of research and a constant updating of the media of instruction in order to keep pace with recent studies and publications. This instruction on the material topoi will include instruction in methods of preserving and classifying information for future reference or the setting up and maintaining of a personal florilegium.

The formal *topoi,* on the other hand, are certain considerations which remain the same for all subjects of discourse, a kind of check-list of talking points to be ticked off as a means of bringing up from the depths of the negative memory in an orderly way all that one has always known about the subject of discourse or even what one has recently learned by consulting the material *topoi* but finds difficult to keep in the focus of attention. A typical catalogue of the formal or technical *topoi* would be: definition, enumeration, genus and species, notation and conjugates, causes and effects, circumstances, antecedents and consequents, contraries, similarity, and probability.

The discussion of *pathos,* or the content of the discourse based upon the psychological make-up of the audience, is based on the well-tried maxim *quidquid recipitur secundum modum recipientis recipitur.* This takes the speaker into audience analysis, the consideration of what arguments and illustrations and general development of a theme will most appeal to listeners of one or the other sex, of a certain age, station in life, spiritual condition, financial level, educational background, etc. Audience analysis of this type is as important in the rhetorical situation as careful diagnosis is essential in the practice of medicine. It is obvious that here lies a boundless field of investigation, endeavoring to discover the un-

[11] *Ibid.* See also Cicero *Topica.*

spoken attitudes and unconscious convictions and the deep-lying motivations of the people to whom it is our calling to preach God's unchanging word in man's ever-changing world.

The second of the four tracts of the perennial rhetoric is *arrangement,* which is concerned with putting into the most effective sequence the thoughts which the speaker has chosen for expression. Its basic principle is that it is not only important to determine what is to be said in a discourse, but also in what order it is to be said, since each thought prepares the listeners either well or poorly for the thought that will follow it. Principles of good arrangement are therefore concerned with the frame of mind and tone of feeling which listeners have at the outset, during the progress and toward the conclusion of the discourse. Methods are discussed of disarming the hostile audience in order to get a fair hearing for an unpopular cause, of arousing the lethargic audience and generating in them an interest which will last for the remainder of the discourse, of preparing for an assault on the will by first laying seige to the intellect and imagination, of enabling the listeners to visualize themselves doing what the speaker wants them to do before coming out explicitly to ask them to do it, etc. General principles of arrangement are given, and then model formulae are explained according to which the first rough draft of a speech or sermon may be outlined. Great sermons are analyzed to discover the strategic disposition of material which has often contributed much toward their effectiveness. A vital distinction is drawn between static and dynamic outline, static outline being a thought-sequence which is logical and orderly, dynamic outline being, over and above this, a sequence which is psychological and persuasive. The outcome of intensive training in rhetorical arrangement should be an almost compulsive sense of unity and progression, and deep insight into the psychological processes which go on in the mind of the listener as the parts of a discourse unfold before him.

The third of the four tracts of the perennial rhetoric is style, if such is really the closest English translation of the Greek *lexis* or the Latin *elocutio.* Whatever word we use for it, the concept of what we call style was much deeper and richer for the ancients than it is for us today. We have in common with them many precepts of correctness and propriety in the use of words and phrases and sentence structures, and we usually go on to speak of vivid descriptions and the effect of the connotations of words, of the minute distinction between similes and metaphors and the meaning of a few terms like metonymy and synecdoche, but we do not get much farther. The larger aspects of effective style are passed off with a few platitudes about the style being the man or about noble thoughts expressing themselves spontaneously in noble language. The rhetorical

movement of a whole series of sentences or even of paragraphs, the variety of stylistic modes into which the same thought can be cast, just as the same argument can be phrased in a dozen different moods of the syllogism — of this we have nearly nothing to say.

The great treatises of the perennial rhetoric, on the contrary, give careful attention to the persuasive movement of language patterns, distinguishing, first of all, various general levels of style, with their rhetorical components and psychological effects, and, in the second place, cataloguing the various stylistic modes in which the basic human emotional attitudes express themselves. The most traditional doctrine distinguishes three levels of style, the plain, middle, and grand, which are not to be thought of as merely degrees of ornateness. Roughly, the plain, middle, and grand styles correspond to the three aims: *docere, delectare*, and *movere.* Each level of style has its own characteristics and its own rhetorical function and is calculated to have a particular psychological effect upon the audience. On all levels, style is viewed not at all as mere ornamentation but as the vehicle of truth, its office being to give forcefulness, effectiveness, persuasiveness to the truth.

The same is true of the figures and tropes with which the perennial rhetoric was widely concerned. These rhetorical patterns and movements, which we may group under the name of stylistic modes, are given various names in Greek and Latin and the modern languages, but in the great treatises of the perennial rhetoric the lists of them are very similar. For most of them there are no corresponding English terms, but a few examples taken at random will show clearly enough what they are.

Take, for example, *epanorthosis* or *correctio.* This is a stylistic mode in which the speaker corrects himself for having used an erroneous or less accurate word or phrase. Its purpose is to drive home more effectively the idea which the speaker wishes to express. Or no, that would be a poor definition of it, since the purpose of *all* the stylistic modes is the more effective expression of an idea. To be more specific (and to give an example with the explanation), I should say that the purpose of epanorthosis or correctio is to emphasize a more adequate expression of the thought by calling the attention of the audience to the inadequacy of the expression of it which has just been given, and by this means also to create in the listeners a feeling that the speaker is very careful and accurate in his statements.

Another mode is *erotesis* or *interrogatio,* which consists of a barrage of questions which the speaker asks, not in order to obtain information, but to drive his point home, making his listeners feel the full impact of their inability to answer, in any way unfavorable to his own case,

the pressing question he puts to them. Again to give an illustration with the explanation of the mode, how many of you have never felt the cogency of a series of questions in which a speaker sums up all his argument? What cuts into the minds and hearts of the listeners more keenly and wins them over more effectively? What is more common in some of the greatest classic orations than such a barrage of questions? Or, leaving secular orations for the eloquence of our Lord Himself, what is more eloquent than the pressing questions He puts to the people concerning Saint John the Baptist? "Whom did you go out in the desert to see," He asks them, "a reed shaking in the wind? . . . But whom did you go out to see? A prophet? Yes, and more than a prophet." [12] And in another place, arguing the power of prayer, does He not press His point most cogently when He challenges the crowd, "If one of you asks his father for a loaf, will he hand him a stone? or for a fish, will he for a fish hand him a serpent? or if he asks for an egg, will he hand him a scorpion?" [13] What, then, after hearing these examples, can we think of as a more useful stylistic mode than this method of pressing a point home by questions?

Another stylistic mode is *prolepsis* or *occupatio,* which consists of suggesting objections to one's own explanation or argument. I know that some will think this is a little trick of style, which they remember having had called to their attention in the footnotes to the Ciceronian orations they read in high school. I know that they will feel that it is one of a number of devices now outmoded and hardly worthy of serious attention. But it is no small matter to create in one's listeners the feeling that one knows all the objections that can be brought against his proposition and is so confident of his cause that he himself seems willing to raise the objections his opponents might forget. It is no small matter to exhibit such complete candor that the audience feels fully satisfied that they have heard both sides of the question, and in this way to dislodge from their minds the silent objections that might stand in the way of persuasion. And these are all the results achieved by the skillful use of *prolepsis* or *occupatio.*

Yet another stylistic mode is *anacoenosis* or *communicatio,* which is an appeal made by the speaker to his listeners or even his opponents for their opinion upon the point he is trying to establish. He may ask them in the midst of debate whether there is anything unfair or erroneous in what he is saying. Still giving an illustration together with the explanation, I can say that I feel sure that you, yourselves, have sometimes felt the powerful effect of such an appeal. There have been times when a speaker

[12] Mt. 11:7-9.
[13] Lk. 11:11-12.

has completely disarmed you by seeming to stop all his argument and appeal very directly to your honesty and fairness to concede freely the point he was trying to make. I don't have to give examples of it. You, yourselves, can recall in your own extemporized and spontaneous talks to students, many times when you appealed to their honesty and fairness as the best proof of what you were maintaining. You knew instinctively that such an appeal would be effective because it implies such great respect for your listeners and great confidence in their intelligence and sense of fair play.

One more instance of a stylistic mode and I am done with them. *Prosopopeia* is a figure in which the speaker suddenly changes character, often without warning of any kind, and speaks as another person, perhaps as one of his opponents or as one of his listeners who has a doubt or objection. He may even switch back and forth, changing characters rapidly in a kind of simulated dialogue.

"You mean he sounds like two different people in the same speech?"

Yes, that's it exactly.

"But isn't that confusing to the listeners?"

Well, that depends on how well it's done and how disposed they are for it.

"But why do it in the first place?"

For a number of reasons.

"Like what, for instance?"

Well, first of all, it gives variety to the rhetorical movement of the discourse, and variety is always good to recall the listeners' waning attention. Secondly, if it is well done, the listeners sense that the speaker knows them intimately and vividly, since he can portray so cleverly not only their very thoughts, but even the manner in which they would express themselves. Thirdly, in some instances, there is great charm and a gentle amusement in such an impersonation, as, for example, when a preacher gives a brief suggestion of a child's simplicity and taking ways when he, the preacher, is talking to a congregation of parents about their family duties.

"I see there's more to this prosopopeia, or whatever you call it, than meets the eye at first glance."

Yes, there's very much more to it, and it can be a fascinating as well as very profitable study to watch some very effective preachers employing it without realizing at all that they are employing a stylistic mode very common in the perennial rhetoric.

We could go on like this endlessly. There is *epanaphora, apostrophe, ecphonesis, periphrasis, synchoresis, hypotyposis, epiphonema,* and a long list of other figures which are commonly discussed in the great treatises of the perennial rhetoric. They are not all of equal value, but they are all worthy of serious consideration, as is the whole lost doctrine of the stylistic modes.

The fourth and last tract in the canon of the perennial rhetoric is delivery, which is sub-divided into vocal variety and bodily action. Of the four tracts, it is perhaps the one which still flourishes in modern rhetorical treatises, although much could still be learned from a renewed study of the classic treatises. The *toni* or tones, for example, which are a major feature of the *Rhetorica ad Herrenium* long thought to be Cicero's but now known to be from another pen, are now almost forgotten except for their survival in a vestigial form in some novitiates and scholasticates, and even there they are certainly not taken as seriously as they formerly were. Yet these exercises, which distinguish levels and styles of delivery corresponding again to the three general aims of *docere, delectare,* and *movere,* may well prove to be exactly what we need to loosen up the stiff and unimaginative student preacher and teach him what possibilities of variety lie within him for the portrayal of the various shades of thought and feeling. The elements of variety in vocal usage and bodily action are so essential to effective delivery that we can hardly afford to continue in what is now the common enough policy of playing down these features of rhetorical instruction in a simply negative reaction to the excesses of the elocutionary movement at the turn of the century.

These, then, in a necessarily superficial overview, are the four tracts of the perennial rhetoric, whose outline and content are roughly definable and recognizable through two thousand and more years of the history of Western culture, and whose concepts and principles are deeply rooted in human nature. Having shown, at least in some degree, that there is such a body of doctrine which can aptly be called the perennial rhetoric, we must now give some evidence for the second part of our general proposition; we must show that this perennial rhetoric has been taken in the past as the framework of homiletic theory.

As soon as the Church had come up from the catacombs in the fourth century and had begun to articulate her attitudes and policies toward the culture in which she found herself, there appeared in the writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers a clear rejection of the sophistic and decadent rhetoric of the day, and, at the same time, a deep appreciation of the

an Bailey, O.F.M.
nas V. Liske
h M. Connors, S.V.D.
ond D. Benard
John T. Fearns
nas D. Rover, O.P.
s McVann, C.S.P.
Leabel, C.P.
es Faivre, C.M.
J. Miller, C.M.
F. Meyer, C.M.
J. O'Keefe, C.S.P.

13. Rev. Eugene Linehan, S.J.
14. Rev. John J. Halloran, S.J.
15. Rev. William A. Faber, O.F.M.
16. Rev. Mel Brady, O.F.M.
17. Rev. Gabriel Buescher, O.F.M.
18. Rev. Germain Schwab, O.F.M.
19. Rev. Thomas W. Coyle, C.SS.R.
20. Rev. Eugene F. Richard
21. Rev. Matthias Feit, C.SS.R.
22. Rev. William Bow
23. Rev. Thomas M. Landry, O.P.
24. Rev. John Boyle, S.J.
25. Rev. John J. Cassels
26. Rev. Charles Connors, C.S.Sp.
27. Rev. Gilbert Zlatar, O.F.M.
28. Rev. Edward F. Hanahoe, S.A.
29. Rev. Fidelis Goodman, M.M.
30. Rev. Victor Mills, O.F.M.
31. Rev. Walter Flaherty
32. Rev. Fidelis Rice, C.P.
33. Rev. Joseph H. O'Neill
34. Rev. Camillus Murray, O.F.M.Conv.
35. Rev. Felician Madigan, O.F.M.Conv.
36. Rev. Regis O'Neil, C.S.C.

Rev. William Dilgen, S.M.M.
Rev. Joseph R. Maxwell, S.J.
Rev. Anthony D. Botti, S.J.
Rev. Owen O'Connor, O.P.
Rev. James McGuire, O.S.F.S.
Rev. Francis X. Kelly, O.S.A.
Rev. John D. Callahan,
Rev. John T. O'Connor, S.C.J.
Rev. Francis X. Curran, S.J.
Rev. Reginald Dumas, O.P.
Rev. John P. Bruni, M.S.C.
Rev. Sylvester MacNutt, O.P.

49. Rev. Ermin Smith, O.S.B.
50. Rev. Anthony Peterman, S.J.
51. Rev. William K. Trivett, S.J.
52. Rev. Wilfred Wilhelm, O.F.M.Cap.
53. Rev. Daniel Durken, O.S.B.
54. Rev. Leo Wobido, S.J.
55. Rev. Joseph Larkin, S.J.
56. Rev. Stephen Rowe, O.F.M.Cap.
57. Rev. Norbert Miller, O.F.M.Cap.
58. Rev. Finian Murphy, M.S.SS.T.
59. Rev. Peter Kenney, S.S.J.
60. Rev. Leo Gaulrapp, C.PP.S.

61. Rev. Francis Gerry,
62. Rev. Charles F. Kelt
63. Rev. Eric Lies, O.S.

Delegates not in picture:
Rev. Frank Calkin
Rev. Robert C. Hu
Rev. Edward McC
Rev. Gregory Mill
Rev. Thomas O'F
Rev. Ervin J. Rau
Rev. Stephen Stae

value of the perennial rhetoric in the service of divine revelation.[14] Passing over the remarks of Saint John Chrysostom and of Saints Basil and the two Gregorys, we can find an outstanding precedent in Saint Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana.* The fourth book of this work is the first treatise on homiletic theory, and its basic principle is that the rhetoric of Greece and Rome must be put to the service of the Church. As if to illustrate the principle, Saint Augustine uses up most of the fourth book discussing how the three purposes of speaking which Cicero had distinguished, and the three levels of style which correspond to them, can be worked out into a theory of preaching. Without going into it in any further detail, the essential point is that Saint Augustine set the precedent of employing the perennial rhetoric as a vehicle for the training of Christian preachers.

After a span of a thousand years, during which the authority of Augustine's work was supreme, we find the great Fathers of the Catholic Reformation at the Council of Trent endorsing the same principle. Saint Charles Borromeo, Augustinus Valerius, Luis of Granada, and a score of others went to the perennial rhetoric for the framework of their homiletic theory.[15] James Laynez and Jerome Nadal did the same, and called for a new synthesis of homiletic tradition with the rhetoric of the ages.[16] Without question, the new homiletic textbooks which appeared in great numbers and dominated the training of Catholic preachers for the following centuries were based on the perennial rhetoric. Nothing would be easier than to multiply instances to show that this was true, but, as impressive as such evidence might be, it would still be the weakest kind of argument in our present discussion, since the conclusion would only be that our predecessors for centuries have, in fact, adapted the concepts and principles of the perennial rhetoric as the basis of their homiletic theory and training. The point yet to be made is that we should do the same. We must still consider the third part of this theme, which completes the general proposition that a renewed study of the perennial rhetoric and of the manner in which it was

[14]St. Augustine summed up the attitude of the patristic age toward rhetoric in the *De Doctrina Christiana* iv.2.3., when he wrote, "The power of eloquence—so very effective in convincing us of either wrong or right—lies open to all. Why, then, do not the good zealously procure it that it may serve truth, if the wicked, in order to gain unjustifiable and groundless cases, apply it to the advantages of injustice and error?"

[15]Cf. "Homiletic Theory in the Late Sixteenth Century," *American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXXXVIII, (May, 1958), pp. 316-332.

[16]Nadal writes in his "De Ministerio Verbi Dei," *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu,* Epistolae Nadal, IV, p. 657, "Utinam ars esset rhetorices inventa, qua oratur christianus institueretur proprie ad conciones ad populum habendas! *In qua arte illa quidem conferrentur, quae Aristoteles, Cicero, Quintilianus tradunt;* ea vero adderentur, quae illi ignorarunt: virtus xpianae *(sic)* religionis, vis virtutum, efficacia gratiae ac donorum Dei, rerum spiritualium sensus. Breviter: ut ars esset oratoria, per quam spiritus et sanctimonia cordibus auditorum imprimeretur." (Italics mine.)

adapted to homiletics in the past will provide us with a structural framework and store of concepts of the utmost practical value.

Approaching this question, let it first of all be said that this desire for a renewed study of the perennial rhetoric is not inspired by an undue reverence for the past. What is old and traditional is not necessarily the best, and it should have to win its way on its own merits just as does the new and revolutionary. What has been long established and accepted does, however, have presumption in its favor. The burden of proof rests upon those who consider it of little value. It is only common sense to say that what has been considered effective rhetorical theory for two thousand years must have some contribution to make to the rhetorical efforts of our own time. At least this view of it should stand until the contrary view can be established after a thorough study and re-evaluation of the great treatises of the perennial rhetoric.

Understanding, then, that the perennial rhetoric should be considered *in possessione* until the need for replacing it can be established, we can go on to indicate some of the advantages that will accrue to modern rhetoric from a renewed study of its traditional and timeless concepts and principles. I shall limit the list of advantages to four: the advantage of a common language, the advantage of an accepted classification of rhetorical theory, the advantage of recapitulating in the training of the modern scholar and teacher of homiletics the experience of centuries, and the advantage of having a ground-plan or blueprint for further progress in the field.

With regard to the advantage of a common language, I take it as an axiom that every organized field of knowledge and investigation must have a standard means of communication, at least among its specialists. The elementary studies in physics and chemistry, for example, are greatly occupied with the explanation of terms and constants which are standard for scientists of all lands and tongues. New discoveries in the natural sciences bring in their train a series of new concepts and terms agreed upon as scientific conventions, and thereafter noted down in the manuals and honored by all further investigators as accepted quantities. This technical language greatly facilitates communication among physicists and chemists, enabling them to express in a word or two a very intricate and elaborate concept or scientific law. The importance of such easy communication is so great that the opinion has even been expressed that Western civilization could never have developed its present technological achievements if the roman numeral system had not been abandoned for the arabic symbols, the roman numerals being so ponderous that they would have frustrated all attempts at the intricate mathematical computation upon which modern technology is based.

Now, if homiletic theory is ever to have a common language to facilitate communication among specialists and the group effort necessary for the development of the field, it seems to me that we must avail ourselves of the highly developed language found in the terms of the perennial rhetoric, with their underlying concepts and principles. Each term employed in the perennial rhetoric has behind it centuries of discussion and commentary; each principle has been revised and recast in an endless series of rhetorical treatises. Even more important, each concept and principle has already been adapted to homiletic theory in dozens of treatises on preaching in past ages, treatises written by men who faced problems in preaching which were not as totally different from our own as we might be inclined to think.

It is only extending this concept of the need for a *lingua franca* to say that the perennial rhetoric serves homiletics also by providing it with a system of classification. The most general division in the perennial rhetoric which divides its content into four tracts on invention, arrangement, style, and delivery, is an example of such classification. A conventional understanding among those in the field of homiletics concerning what each of these four tracts should contain would be, in at least one opinion, a great step forward. A further division of sermon content into material drawn from consideration of the three modes of persuasion — ethos, logos, and pathos — would be another step forward. A distinction between formulary and non-formulary principles of arrangement, between stylistic modes which are figures of words and those which are figures of thought, between vocal variety and bodily action as the two chief elements of delivery, and many similar distinctions or classifications would all be marks of progress.

The reason that I call the acceptance of these structures a mark of progress or step forward is that a good system of classification contains within it a principle of organic growth. Perhaps this principle is best explained by an illustration. The classification system in a good library, for example, serves not merely as an orderly description of the library's present holdings, but also as a vehicle for the orderly assimilation of new acquisitions, so that a good library becomes, through its system of classification, almost an organic thing, constantly growing to the stature and proportions which its classification system makes possible. The same would happen in the field of homiletics if we take as the framework of our homiletic theory the classifications of the perennial rhetoric. Its terms and concepts and principles and tracts would not only enable us to take stock of what we have already acquired, and enable us to find it when we need it, but would also show, as a good library classification system does, the lacunae

among our holdings, the areas of theory that are still unexplored and undeveloped.

The third advantage of taking the perennial rhetoric as the framework of homiletic theory would be reaped by those who would become versed in the terms and teachings of the perennial rhetoric by tracing the steps of its long historical development. To have a single term for it, we might call it the benefit of recapitulation. In the formation of a scholar in any field or of a fully competent teacher in any theological discipline, I believe there must be a process closely resembling the formation of the human body itself, as this formation is sometimes described by physiologists. The formation of the individual, they teach us, recapitulates step by step the successful adaptations which the human race has made to its environment. In a matter of hours, days and weeks, the human embryo relives the years and centuries and millenia of experience and adaptation of which it is the product and the heir. Whether or not this description of the process is good scientific theory, it is an apt illustration of the role played in the formation of any scholar by a study of the history of his field.

We can all recall, for example, how greatly we were aided in our theological studies by reviewing the controversies of the past. In understanding Christology we were greatly aided by the study of the heretical teachings of the fourth century and the doctrines and arguments by which they were countered by the Fathers. In understanding the issues of the tract on grace, we were aided by a review of Saint Augustine's polemics against the Pelagians. In understanding the Tridentine decrees on justification and transubstantiation, we were helped by a study of the teachings of Luther and Zwingli and Aecolampadius and the others to whom these decrees were a reply. In short, a definition of Catholic doctrine is often best understood by reviewing the heretical doctrines which made such a definition necessary. By studying the various theological opinions that have been accepted or rejected in the history of the development of doctrine, the theologian begins to understand not only the doctrine in debate, but the tendencies of the human mind when confronted with certain theological problems. In this way, the theologian has, at the completion of his training, not only a mind in which are fully formed the concepts and principles of Catholic doctrine, but a mind steeped in the collective experience of theologians who have been grappling for centuries with that same doctrine. With such formation, he is much less likely to think that he has come upon an original and profitable contribution to his field when there occurs to him as his own one of the discarded notions which litter the highways of intellectual history. He is well prepared to find what

will succeed in the future because he has so carefully studied what has failed in the past.

The formative influence of a careful recapitulation of the development of the perennial rhetoric would be a great benefit to the specialist in homiletics. One does not understand Plato and Aristotle without some knowledge of the sophist who preceded them. There is great danger of being deceived by Saint Paul's forthright rejection of "the persuasive words of human wisdom" if one does not understand the decadent Asian rhetoric which characterized Greek culture in his time. The features of Patristic eloquence which we today find strange and unacceptable are better understood against the background of the period of the Second Sophistic in which the Fathers flourished. The homiletic reform achieved in sixteenth century Italy and seventeenth century France, the influence of which is still very tangible in the homiletic theory of our own time, can only be appreciated in contrast to the abuses which preceded it. From an historical study of such movements and reforms and the features of homiletic theory and training which issued from them, the student and scholar in the field of homiletics today would reap the benefit of sharing the collective experence of those who, throughout the history of the Church, have been concerned with the theory of preaching.

The final advantage of a renewed study of the perennial rhetoric and of adopting it as a framework for homiletic theory is that it would provide a groundplan or blueprint for the development of homiletic training. It would force us in our seminaries to provide instruction in areas of the science and art of effective preaching which we are now almost entirely neglecting. In most of our seminaries, it would be a great innovation merely to speak of four separate tracts of homiletic theory: invention, arrangement, style, and delivery. It is typical in our seminaries today to be content with a twofold division into composition and delivery. The theory of composition is sometimes scarcely distinguishable from what is taught in any good college course in English, and the theory of delivery often amounts to little more than a checklist of the peccadilloes committed by the seminarian in the pulpit against good vocal usage or bodily action. There would be an immediate change in atmosphere and emphasis if the professors and their students would undertake to discuss and study, for example, a fully developed tract on invention, with its modes of persuasion and methods of audience analysis, its material and formal topoi, the norms of ecclesiastical pronouncements regarding propriety of sermon content, and dozens of other items which would be suggested by a perusal of tracts on invention in the treatises of the perennial rhetoric.

There would be a similar ferment and development immediately if attention were then given to a full discussion of the tract on arrangement, treating the laws of attention and interest, the general principles of rhetorical involvement and development, and specific formulae or patterns of sermon outline, all the while studying a whole series of published sermons as examples of the effective psychological sequence of ideas. And what can we say would happen if the doctrine of style in the perennial rhetoric were once more fully examined? The usefulness of the distinction of three levels of style would be a fertile topic for investigation, and the application of each kind of style to the three purposes of preaching would be next. Then would come an explanation and exemplification of the stylistic modes, as they are first conceived in classical rhetoric and then discovered as the works of nature rather than of art in the pages of the Bible and in the homilies of the Fathers of the Church. In the tract on delivery there would be a new consideration of the ancient system of the tones, coupled with all that is best in excellent modern treatments of articulation and diction. Methods of developing empathy with one's own material prior to preaching it would be discussed in the setting of our new knowledge of psychology.

For the sake of a necessary brevity at this point, let us be content to say that the adoption of the four traditional tracts of the perennial rhetoric, and the intensive study of each in turn, would provide the professor and his students with a fund of common knowledge and mutually understood principles and concepts upon which they could draw freely in the discussion of the sermons delivered in practice preaching. Instead of merely handing the student a checklist of his faults with the comment that he is or is not improving, the sermon critic could call up whole blocks of thought and study lying in the student's negative memory from the systematic instruction in homiletic theory given prior to practice preaching. the student would then have more than a simple *ad hoc* commentary on his preaching effort of a day, but would gradually acquire a systematic critical method which would enable him to monitor his own sermons and guide himself toward continued progress even after the years of formal training.

I believe that what has now been said has established, at least in broad outline, one man's viewpoint on why the perennial rhetoric must become the framework of our homiletic theory. We can hope that in the discussion following this paper there will be searching questions to light up its darker areas. May it please God that these questions expose the weakness as well as the strength of what has been said, so that we who are so largely responsible throughout this land for the effectiveness

with which the word of God is preached may accept and adopt only those conclusions which in His Providence are for the better development of our work.

There remains one thought which I would like to express before inviting full and frank discussion. The men engaged in teaching homiletics in our seminaries and preaching the word of God in our pulpits are heirs to centuries of scholarship and tradition. There is not a man here in whom there does not abide a sense of the continuity of human thought and art. There have been historical circumstances, notably three centuries during which the Catholic clergy in English-speaking countries were hampered on every side by persecution, which have weakened the lines of continuity with the homiletic theory once based on the perennial rhetoric. But there is no limit to what can be achieved once the heirs of a rich tradition turn to the study of their own origins and of the achievements of their predecessors. One man cannot restore this whole tradition, even in a lifetime. Neither can ten men. But if those whose life's work is specially concerned with all that has to do with preaching the word of God more effectively will combine their efforts, then we can carve from the ancient quarries of the perennial rhetoric and of the homiletic treatises based upon it the foundation stones of a homiletic theory able to bear the weight of a great edifice of Christian eloquence.

Taking the best of the past, and adding to it the best of the present, and awaiting eagerly the best of the future in the science and art of giving effectiveness to the truth, we here today can undertake to build a system of homiletic theory, training, and practice, which will be as worthy as we can make it of its role in the high vocation of preaching to the hearts of men redeemed by Christ the word which He has spoken for their salvation.

Pastors After His Own Heart

In the third chapter of the Book of Jeremias the Lord says to His people, "I will give you pastors according to my own heart, and they shall feed you with knowledge and with doctrine."

Popes and Church councils have often repeated these words of Jeremias in their pronouncements on preaching. The passage occurs in a papal instruction as late as 1951, when the late Pius XII greeted by letter the Ninth National Catechetical Congress, held at Chicago under the presidency of Cardinal Stritch.

Through the Christian ages the people of God have been fed spiritually through catechetical instructions and sermons. The concern of this paper is with sermons, and specifically with the themes of sermons. It is hoped that the paper will have a double interest to the members of our newborn Homiletic Society, because of the desire we all have to perform our pulpit duty well and because of the need to prepare our seminarians for their future duty as worthy heralds of the word of God.

We have this duty stated in Canon 1347, paragraph one, the Code of Canon Law. "In sacred sermons must be explained pre-eminently the things which the faithful are to believe and do for salvation." To those who wish to know what the Church expects its teachers to preach about, the Canon taken by itself is too brief a statement. But behind its spare declaration lies a vast body of Church directives.

The words of Canon 1347 are almost a repetition of the Council of Trent. At its fifth session, held in 1546, the Council decreed that prelates and others in charge of souls, ". . . according to their own and their people's capacity, are to feed the people with saving words, teaching what all must believe for salvation, and proclaiming to them, with brevity and facility of speech, the vices they must flee and the virtues they must practise in order to escape eternal punishment and gain eternal glory" *(Session 5, de ref., chapter 2).*

In 1563 the Council went over some of the same ground at its twenty-fourth session. The conciliar fathers ordered that pastors of souls

were to announce the Sacred Scriptures and the divine law at stated times; that they were to explain the various sacraments before administering them; that at Mass they were to preach to the people in the vernacular "the sacred words and admonitions of salvation; and setting aside all useless questions, they were to sow these things in their hearts and instruct them in the law of God" *(Session 24, de ref., chapters 4 and 5).*

Trent went beyond giving directions and took a practical step for the good of the Christian pulpit. As early as the fourth session the Council desired a catechism to be drawn up for children and uninstructed adults. Later the fathers of Trent planned something broader. At a meeting of September 11, 1563, they resolved on a catechism to benefit the parish clergy when preaching to all the faithful on Sundays and holy days. On the following November 2, they decreed in the twenty-fourth session that the bishops should have the projected catechism translated into the language of the people. At the next session the Council, realizing that its work was coming to a close, entrusted the completion of this "Catechism for Parish Priests" to Pope Pius IV.

Pius handed over the work of completing the Catechism to a committee soon headed by his saintly nephew, Cardinal Charles Borromeo. This "Hercules of bishops," as he was called by a biographer,[1] urged the editors on to their labors. By 1566 the work was finished. It was published by order of Pope St. Pius V, and soon was being translated into the languages of Europe. At last the Church had an authoritative handbook of pulpit instruction — authoritative, for it was started by an ecumenical council, published by a pope, commended and imposed by several popes. Rightly it has been called the Catechism of the Council of Trent, or the Roman Catechism.

Before examining the contents of this Catechism, it is helpful to see something of its antecedents in the forms which Christian instruction took in the previous thousand years. By the time the Church reached its fifth century there were three clearly demarcated kinds of instructions — the sermon, the homily, and the catechesis. As early as the middle of the second century, according to the Apology of St. Justin, the bishop addressed the people at the liturgy after the reading of "the prophets and apostles." This address became the homily, a simple commentary on the epistle or gospel portion just read. Most of the early preaching of the Church was in this simple homiletic form. St. Gregory the Great found the same unpretentious manner of instruction in the words of the Apostles. "They took the greatest care to preach their message to the unlettered in a man-

[1] Godeau, cited in *Reformer: St. Charles Borromeo*, Margaret Yeo, p. 103.

ner that was simple and within their grasp, not with profound and difficult ideas." [2]

For great occasions the abler speakers among the bishops, already trained in the profane schools of rhetoric, resorted to highly oratorical forms of address. St. John Chrysostom and St. Ambrose are names readily associated with splendid oratory.

Side by side with the familiar homily and the eloquent sermon was another kind of instruction. It was the catechesis, and it was destined to have a greater influence on the subject-matter of preaching than the other two forms. During the first four centuries the usual entrance into the Church was by adult Baptism. Since the candidates had to learn the Creed and the Our Father [3] for the ceremony, these prayers were explained to them beforehand. The explanation, called a catechesis, became more elaborate and by the end of the fourth century, as we see in St. Cyril of Jerusalem's two *Catecheses* and St. Augustine's treatise *de Catechizandis Rudibus,* it was a detailed instruction in the principal articles of faith as contained in the Creed, the Pater, and in the sacramental rites connected with the Christian initiation — Baptism, Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist.

In the early Middle Ages the fashion for great oratory declined, and it was the simple homily and catechesis that determined the subject-matter of preaching. Just when the catechumenate was dying out, lesser churches than the cathedral were beginning in a rudimentary way. The clergy set over these secondary churches, many of them with little sacred training, were told to instruct their people in the meaning of the Creed and Our Father. To this they were to add instruction on the virtues and vices, subjects going back to the Didache's moral teaching on the Two Ways, the way of death and the way of life. Those clergy who could not instruct were at least to read a homily taken from the writings of the Fathers. The larger churches observed the same scheme of instruction and added explanations of the Sunday epistles and gospels.

As seen in the sermonaries prepared for the use of parish priests, by the eleventh century the list of instructions had broadened to include the beatitudes, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the works of mercy. Two centuries later a council held at Lambeth under Archbishop John Peckham of Canterbury reflects in its regulations a still larger scope to the parish

[2] *Moralium Libri XXV*, l. XVII, xxvi.

[3] Instruction on the Our Father is found in the Didache, which said that the prayer was to be said three times daily. See "Catechese" in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique,* II, 1880 (J. Bareille), and "Didache" in *Catholic Encyclopedia,* IV, 779 (J. Chapman).

instructions. Four times a year, said the council, every parish priest should explain the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the two commandments of love,[4] the deadly sins, the principal virtues, and the sacraments. This arrangement obtained uniformly in Europe down to the time of the council of Trent.

It is clear what the fathers of that Council and the compilers of its Catechism had in mind about the subject-matter of preaching. They were adhering to a pattern followed by the Church for at least ten centuries. So the Catechism was arranged in four divisions: Apostles' Creed, Sacraments, Decalogue, and Prayer, especially the Lord's Prayer. Within these divisions the compilers placed much of Trent's own teaching on the Holy Eucharist, the Mass, Transubstantiation, remission of sin by Baptism, justifying grace, papal supremacy. With merit the Introduction of the Catechism could say that the explanations contained in its four divisions "includes almost everything that a Christian should know."

The compilers of the Roman Catechism did not think of their book as something for preachers to explain in continuous order, beginning at the first article of the Creed and ending at the *Amen* of the Our Father. In the Introduction they recommended an application of the material in the Catechism to the gospel or other Scripture read at the Sunday Mass. They gave an example for the first Sunday of Advent. Taking the first verse of the gospel on the end of the world, they sent the parish priest for the related doctrine to the seventh article of the Creed, "From thence He shall come to judge the living and the dead." The compilers did not take the obvious next step and draw up a table of accommodations for all Sundays. That seems to have been done for the first time in a French translation of the Catechism that appeared before 1645. Soon a "Praxis Catechismi," as it was called, or application of the Catechism to the Sunday scripture readings, was commonly appended to both the Latin edition and the translations.

So between the Roman Catechism and its "Praxis" the Catholic pulpit had a vade-mecum of themes and matter for the instruction of the faithful. This is evidently true of the ordinary Sunday sermon. It is equally true of special sermons, even controversial discourses. As Leo XIII wrote in his encyclical of September 8, 1899, to the clergy of France, "He who understands this Catechism will always have at his service those aids by which a priest is equipped to preach with fruit . . . and will be enabled to refute the objections of unbelievers." Cardinal Newman testified to his own

[4] This stress upon the two great commandments of the New Law is found in the Didache. See "Catechese" (J. Bareille), as above. The Way of Life consists in the love of God and of our neighbor. So "Didache" (J. Chapman), as above.

use of it. "I rarely preach a sermon but that I go to this beautiful and complete Catechism to get both my matter and my doctrine." [5]

The next force to influence the contents of sermons came from St. Pius X and his encyclical *Acerbo Nimis,* of April 15, 1905. What the Pope wanted was a Sunday catechetical instruction for adults apart from the Sunday sermon. It was not a new idea, for St. Charles Borromeo had successfully organized such classes in Milan.[6] In terms of *Acerbo Nimis* pastors conducting the adult Sunday catechism were to follow the Roman Catechism . . . "In such a way as to cover in four or five years all the matter related to the Creed, the Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, Prayer, and the Precepts of the Church." A later decree of the Congregation of the Council, dated January 12, 1935, added to this list: ". . . and also the matter in the evangelical counsels, grace, the virtues, sin, and the four last things."

In many places, including the United States, the catechism for adults did not come about in the way that St. Pius planned. Father Augustine, the Benedictine canonist, has explained why it could not be observed here, that its literal application would mean grave physical hardship for missionary pastors, who would have to return to their various Sunday stations a second time to hold a catechism class for the faithful.[7] Whatever the cause, that part of *Acerbo Nimis* was not observed according to the letter, and instead many bishops applied the Pope's directives to the sermons at Low Masses on Sunday. They told the parish priests to fit Sunday instructions into a five-year or three-year cycle, and many bishops published sermon outlines for the clergy to follow.

The Roman Catechism is, therefore, the Church's own thesaurus of sermon themes. But other subjects are specifically called for in conciliar and papal regulations. Trent pointed especially to the Sacred Scriptures as a prime theme.

A special word here about the Bible. It is to be used much more than as the topic of a sermon. It is the chief source and material of all sermons. St. Jerome wrote, "The speech of the priest should be seasoned with the reading of the Scriptures." Pope Leo XIII said in the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (November 18, 1893) that the word of God has an eloquence "wondrously varied, rich and worthy of great events." He added that pulpit orators have acknowledged their debt "to pious meditation on the Bible." Pius X wrote in the encyclical *Sacrorum Antistitum*

[5] *Apologia Pro Vita Sua,* Longmans edition of 1902, p. 280.
[6] C. Orsenigo, *Life of St. Charles Borromeo,* pp. 96-97.
[7] Augustine (Bachofen), *A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law,* 2nd ed., VI, p. 345.

(September 1, 1910), "The Bible . . . is unquestionably the chief source of sacred eloquence." An American bishop remarked of the sermons of the famous Jesuit orator Father William O'Brien Pardow that they sounded like a biblical concordance. A sermon devoid of the revealed word of God may instruct, but it lacks that which, beyond all other language, has the power to teach, touch, warm and move.

It should be added here that the *Ut Quae,* an instruction of the Consistorial Congregation on the Norms of Sacred Preaching, dated June 28, 1917, included with the Bible the study of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church (n. 22).

To return to the themes that we are to preach upon. In his encyclical *Divinum illud munus* (March 9, 1897), Pope Leo XIII told pastors to instruct their people often and at length about the Holy Spirit. St. Pius X, through the Congregation of the Council (December 20, 1905), said that pastors were to promote frequent and daily assistance at Mass and reception of Holy Communion. Canon 1273 of the present Code urges the same. The same Congregation of the Council (January 12, 1930), told pastors occasionally to inculcate modesty in dress, and recommended the feasts of the Blessed Virgin as appropriate times for this instruction. The Consistorial Congregation (January 12, 1935), instructed pastors and preachers to urge parents on to their duty of teaching catechism to their children and sending them to the parish catechetical classes.

The Code of Canon Law has scattered references to the subject-matter of sermons. The faithful are to be often warned of the obligation to bring infants for Baptism as soon as possible (Canon 770). At the Lenten sermons the people are to be reminded of their Easter duty and annual confession (Canons 859 and 906). Parents are to be given advice on the Christian education of their children (Canon 1372). All the faithful are to be warned of the dangers coming from bad reading, especially from books that are banned by law (Canon 1405; on the related subject of good reading, Pope Pius XI told the Lenten preachers of 1929 to talk about a good press). Pastors are to teach the people prudently about the sacrament of Marriage and its impediments (Canon 1018; closely allied to this, the encyclical of Pius XI on the Christian Education of Youth, December 31, 1929, said that matters of the Sixth Commandment are to be treated with utmost circumspection).

So much for themes which the Church wants preached. Before considering matter which the Church outlaws from the pulpit, we should look at two important steps which the Church takes to safeguard the preaching office from abuses.

As the first safeguard for a sound pulpit stands the local Ordinary. According to the Council of Trent the first duty of a bishop is preaching. All other preachers in the diocese, said the Council, are his substitutes. In keeping with that basic canonical notion, the present Code laid down in detail the procedure for licensing preachers (Canon 1337-1342), and the decree *Ut Quae* on the Norms of Sacred Preaching issued by the Consistorial Congregation on June 28, 1917, outlined the vigilance which the Ordinary is to exercise thereafter over his preachers, withdrawing their license if he is not satisfied with their doctrine or character, and even stopping a preacher in the course of his sermon when his words offend against the Church's prohibitions concerning the proper matter or manner of the pulpit (*Ut Quae,* n. 30 *c*).

The second safeguard is the ideal which the Church holds up for its preaching clergy. To be worthy heralds of the word of God they must acquire sound doctrine and lead lives consistent with their profession. In the second paragraph of Canon 1347 the Church states epigrammatically what their doctrine shall be. "Let them preach Christ crucified." Here the Code is quoting I Corinthians, 2:4, where St. Paul is telling his converts that he came to them not with the persuasive words of worldly wisdom, but he came preaching Jesus and Him crucified. This does not mean that the preacher is to be naive in secular knowledge or the ordinary graces of oratory. Pope Pius XI said of the standards of learning that ought to obtain among the clergy, "The priest must be graced with no less knowledge and culture than is usual among well-bred and well educated people of his day" (*Ad Catholici Sacerdotii,* December 20, 1933). But beyond secular learning and even ordinary theological learning, as Pope Benedict XV pointed out in his classic encyclical on preaching, *Humani Generis* (June 12, 1917), are three kinds of knowledge which the preacher must have, a knowledge of self, "which will lead a priest to renounce his own advantage;" a knowledge of God, which "will lead him to make everyone else know and love God;" and a knowledge of his own office, which "will lead him to discharge his own duties and teach others to do theirs."

At the same time the Church wants its spokesman to live a life consistent with the gospel. St. Jerome wrote to the priest Nepotian, "Let not your conduct be a contradiction to your preaching, lest when you are speaking in the church someone will say, 'Why do you not practise what you preach?' " There is to be a oneness between doctrine and character. For this the Church has praised the Ruthenian apostle, St. John Kenty. The Roman Breviary for October 20 says of him, "simul docens et faciens." Almost the same is said of St. Peter Martyr in the Dominican Breviary, "Verbo, vitã praedicat."

Despite these precautions of episcopal vigilance and right standards of learning and holiness, the Church knows that abuses will get into the pulpit. To meet them it has the second paragraph of Canon 1347 and Chapter Two of the *Ut Quae* referred to above. The Canon reads, "Let the heralds of the divine word abstain from profane or deep themes that are beyond the average grasp of their hearers; let them carry on their ministry of the gospel not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, or in the profane display and finery of empty, calculating eloquence, but in showing forth spirit and power, preaching not themselves but Jesus crucified.

The *Ut Quae* goes into some detail about abuses which gave the Holy See concern under three pontiffs, Leo XIII, St. Pius X and Benedict XV.[8] According to their statements and the *Ut Quae,* some preachers have expounded worldly philosophies currently popular, or a watered-down Christianity which exploits Christ and His religion as a kind of natural philanthropy without supernatural values and sanctions. Some have sought to gain large crowds, often with self-laudatory advertising, and have despised small audiences and the humbler employments of the ministry. Some have abandoned the simplicity proper to sacred eloquence for a style modelled after the declamatory harangues of the courtroom or the journalese of the newspapers. Some, prompted by vainglory or "filthy lucre," have preferred themes that elicited the applause of the congregation. On the last point the *Ut Quae* quotes from St. Jerome's letter to Nepotian, "When you are teaching in the church, it is not popular acclaim but the sigh of sorrow that you should arouse. Let the tears of your listeners be your applause."

We read these papal rebukes with a sense of unfamiliarity, for little, if any, of the mentioned abuses crossed the ocean. Nothing more of them has been heard since 1917, from which we can conclude that as large-scale offenses they vanished. Yet the warnings of the *Ut Quae* should be taken to heart.

Other subjects prohibited by the Church have a more universal bearing. Some of them are banned outright, without any qualification. Some, subjects that are not entirely alien to the pulpit, the local Ordinary can allow "after mature consideration and for reasons of necessity" (*Ut Quae,* n. 20).

Obviously ruled out is all heresy and other statement against faith and good morals; all erroneous or scandalous doctrine; all matters

[8] Leo XIII, *Providentissimus Deus,* November 18, 1893; St. Pius X, *Pieni l'animo,* July 20, 1906, and *Sacrorum Antistitum,* September 10, 1910; Benedict XV, *Humani Generis,* June 15, 1917; the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, *Ut Quae,* Norms of Sacred Preaching, June 28, 1917.

protected by the seal of confession; verbal injury against the Holy Father, the Roman Curia and the local bishop. Canon 1347, 4° indicates the stern steps to be taken when a sermon has heretical, erroneous, or scandalous doctrine.

Politics is severely barred. Several authoritative statements have made that clear. Thus the *Ut Quae,* (n. 20): "As to politics, all preachers are absolutely forbidden to speak of it in the church." This prohibition has nothing to do with instruction in good citizenship, or with the strong measures in the political field which popes and bishops have to take in times of grave danger to the Church.

Also entirely forbidden are attacks against individual persons. The canonist Matthaeus Conte a Coronata gives several reasons for this warning, and adds that it particularly refers to attacks on the ecclesiastical and civil authority.[9]

Canon 1286 says that the pulpit is no place to air specious questions about relics. The law does not intend to shield dubious relics from proper scientific inquiry but bars questions which "rest on bare conjecture, merely probable arguments, or prejudiced opinions, especially when couched in language that savors of mockery or disrespect."

About subjects that need previous approval of the Ordinary the various papal instructions have little to say. The *Ut Quae* (n. 21) says that funeral eulogies are allowed only with permission of the Ordinary, and he can demand the manuscript beforehand. This severe restriction does not seem to apply to our ordinary sermon at funerals in places where that is the custom. The Holy See had in mind occasions when funerals were used for political demonstrations.

Another caution given in the *Ut Quae* (n. 23) has to do with the matter of sermons. The Consistorial instruction says that profane authors are to be used only with great care, all the more so if they are unbelievers, heretics, or apostates. The instruction continues by saying that the authority of living persons should never be invoked, since "faith and Christian morality do not need such champions and defenders." There is no necessity to think that the expression "living persons" means all contemporary authors. The context of the *Ut Quae* points to unbelievers, etc., as the living persons so intended. Such was the understanding of a council held at Malines three years after the instruction, and of the canonist Matthaeus Conte a Coronata.[10]

[9] *Institutiones Juris Canonici,* n. 273.

[10] *Acta et Decreta Concilii Provincialis Mechlinensis IV,* a. 1920, n. 303; *Institutiones Juris Canonici,* n. 264.

In conclusion something should be said about the spirit that should actuate the preacher. For if the spirit is right, the words will be right. That spirit is summed up by Pope Benedict XV in his encyclical *Humani Generis.* He quotes II Corinthians, 5:20, "For Christ you are ambassadors," and then adds that preachers . . . "should have the same purpose in discharging their office that Christ had in conferring it on them . . . they must diffuse the light of truth made known by God, and they must quicken and nourish the supernatural life in those who hear them. In a word, by seeking the salvation of souls they are to promote the glory of God."

SUPPLEMENT

Soon after this paper went to the printer, the fourth volume of *The Canon Law Digest* appeared. Apropos of Canon 1327 the *Digest* (p. 386) called attention to the brief allocution given by Pope Pius XII on September 14, 1956, about Preaching the word of God. Addressing the Sixth National Week on Pastoral Methods, the late Pope cast several fresh lights on the preaching office which no student of homiletics can afford to ignore. Among them — and to our purpose — Pius XII said that every priest should have in mind our Lord's words on various Christian duties "and then use them at the proper moment in his own preaching, with the realization: This is what our Lord did." As listed by the Pope, the duties emphasized by Christ include prayer, inward and outward humility, self-denial and sacrifice, mastery of the passions, carrying one's cross, tending in perfection, love of neighbor, submission to the authority of the Church, and the duty based on the holiness and indissolubility of marriage. With these duties the Pope joined our Lord's two other teachings, on God's judgment and retribution, and on His boundless mercy (*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* 48 [1956] 703; see also *The Pope Speaks,* Spring of 1957, p. 385).

Contemporary Problems in Sunday Morning Preaching

Every Saturday night, I would venture to say, in most of the rectories all over the country, along about ten o'clock or so, you will find the assistant pastor — and often the pastor himself — sitting around the kitchen table having a snack. Somehow someone always gets around to asking that uneasy question, "What's the sermon for tomorrow?"

This little weekly scene from clerical life indicates that there are three things wrong: they are unprepared to preach, they have no idea of what to say, and they will undoubtedly be ineffective on Sunday morning.

These, then, I would say are the three big contemporary problems in Sunday morning preaching: (1) finding the time to prepare; (2) knowing what to talk about; (3) getting results or being effective.

No one is more aware of the terrific tension and pressure under which the busy American priest works than I. I am well aware of the many sick calls, the wakes to be attended, the youth clubs to be created, guided, and preserved, the Altar and Rosary Society to be humored, the converts to be instructed, the confessions to be heard, the hospitals to be visited, the beggars, the panhandlers and the con men to be ushered out, or listened to and given in to against your better judgment, the marriages to be arranged for and the marriages to be held together, the drinkers to be lectured, the unruly children in school to be talked to, the servers to be trained, the parish bulletin to be sweated over, the Office to be said, "digne, attente ac devote," with one eye often on the clock, and, if one is a pastor, the janitor to be listened to about the hundreds of repairs to be done, and the squabbles between the cook and maid to be refereed, the army of insistent and persistent salesmen to be refused — well, it's all in a day's and night's work.

But, we must preach and do it well, no matter how heavy the burden of daily work or the condition of our health. "No one," says Saint John Chrysostom, "takes into account that despondency or trouble, or anxiety, or passion has darkened the clearness of the priest's mind and hindered the clear expression of his thoughts, and that, as he is a man,

he cannot be ever the same, nor succeed always in all things, and that it is natural he should sometimes fail and display less than his accustomed vigour. They will take none of these into account, but they load him with blame, judging him as if he were an angel." [1]

Yes, they judge us as if we were angels, and they are quick to detect the unready, unprepared preacher. They know at once when we are giving a spur-of-the-moment, off-the-cuff talk. Too often it *is* the fault of the priest, for, besides being too busy, he is often too proud or cocky about his ability to talk. Many priests imagine they can do anything without any preparation. You find them experts on the writing of novels, television plays, movies, music — nothing is too abstruse for their critical ability. So on many a Sunday morning the "expert," the priest who can give out on *"de omni re scibili et de quibusdam aliis,"* mounts the pulpit and gives a disorganized talk full of theological jargon and ill-considered examples.

The unprepared speaker is *unaware* of the urgency for excellent preaching. I should say that one of the first duties of the teacher of speech in seminaries is to make the students aware of this urgency to preach well. We must beware of the bad example of the English priests and bishops at the time of the Reformation. Their superficial preaching begot superficial spirituality among the people. There were many denunciations of vice of every kind, sterile moral denunciations, says Philip Hughes, but few solid doctrinal talks.[2] Moral denunciation is easy for the unprepared preacher. Any timid little fellow in the rectory can thunder and roar on Sunday morning — if he is unprepared!

We have got to preach well! "Preach the word, be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, entreat, rebuke with all patience and teaching. For there will come a time when they will not endure the sound doctrine, but having itching ears, will heap up to themselves teachers according to their own lust, and they will turn away their hearing from the truth and turn aside rather to fables. But do thou be watchful in all things, bear with tribulation patiently, work as a preacher of the Gospel, fulfill thy ministry" [3] — and be prepared to preach!

Now, how to find the time to prepare.

The only way to avoid that frenzied search for a sermon after the Saturday night visit to the kitchen is to have a definite plan. You must be as definite in planning for your Sunday morning preaching as you are in setting aside the time for your office and meditation. First, I believe

[1]St. John Chrysostom *On the Priesthood* Bk.v.5.

[2]Philip Hughes, *The Reformation in England,* (New York: Macmillan, 1951), I, 98.

[3]II Tim. 4:2-5.

it best to do something every day of the week toward preparing for Sunday. It is amazing how a few minutes time away from the TV set, just fifteen or even less, on Monday will help you to pick the topic or definite idea for the talk. Tuesday, do the same thing, a few minutes on thinking over the idea. Wednesday, make an outline of some sort. Thursday, well, it may be your day off, but on the way home or on the way to the ball game or the golf course or the bowling alley, decide how you will begin the talk, turn over in your mind a few different ways to start. Friday, write it out. Saturday, rehearse the talk in your room.

Follow that day-by-day plan and I guarantee you will be prepared every Sunday.

Now, for the moment, allow me to go back over "Friday, write it out." There are undeniable advantages to writing out the sermon. First, the talk is definitely stated. The unprepared speaker is always fighting battles with himself over the choice of words. The ready word does not come. The speaker resorts to groan-like "ah-uh and uh" and slows up the tempo of his talk as well as creating distrust in his listeners as to his worthiness as a preacher. If the speaker writes the talk, he has a chance to change words, to re-phrase ideas, to test the sound of words, to find a better example, to develop each idea more fully than he could upon the spur of the moment as he stands composing the talk before the audience. Writing the speech gives a fluency of thought and a crisp, decisive tone to one's speaking effort.

Let me hasten to say that I do not recommend the strict memorizing of the sermon after it is written. To me the writing is only a means to make the talk definite in every respect. It is a battle plan that can be altered, improved as inspiration comes during the rehearsal.

Everything is against the strict memorizing of the talk: (1) It destroys spontaneity. A genuine sense of communication is destroyed by a labored, memorized talk. It is the old "elocution piece" over again. It requires a great deal of mastery over the speech to be able, like an actor, to deliver a memorized talk and still give the impression that it is spontaneous, genuine communication between speaker and listeners. I believe it is better training for seminarians to teach them to use the written speech in rehearsal, changing words as they go along, provided they know the entire outline of the sermon.

(2) Memorizing tends to prevent good, free bodily action. The speaker pays so much attention to the sequence of words that he has no natural impulse to move his body to assist in communicating.

(3) Memorizing makes it difficult to cope with emergencies. Latecomers tussle with over-zealous ushers to be seated, at times stray dogs and cats

meander down the aisle, children cry, mothers hush them in loud tones, choir members giggle and whisper, windows bang and people faint! And the preacher who has memorized his sermon finds that one slip of the mind off the track and away goes the train of his thought. The speaker is startled. He becomes frantic trying to recall the last words he said. The longer he prolongs the search for the next word the more frightened he becomes and the more frightened he becomes the harder it is to remember.

Yes, I'd say it is best to have a plan of doing some work on the talk every day and rehearsing it without memorizing it.

Let's go back to the kitchen and the Saturday night clerical Chowder and Marching Society and we hear the youngest assistant say, "What shall we talk about Sunday?" And, of course, the older one says, "About five minutes."

As long as the question of time was brought up, I hope the day will come when pastors write shorter announcements or have all the announcements printed, because it is the long, windy, wordy announcement about some inconsequential meeting or other that takes up so much time that little is left for a good talk. Let the pastor learn to write an announcement as though it were an "ad" on a billboard or in a magazine. Instead of worrying about getting the people out on time, let them sweat over a punchy, precise, slogan-like ad. Too often the wordy announcement has shunted the sermon off to the side. Traffic jams at the doors and out on the corner where the policeman is muttering softly under his breath can be avoided if less time is given to announcements. We find that twenty-five minutes can comfortably be given to announcements, Epistle, Gospel, and talk at the Low Masses. This, of course, will vary with the number of Communions in different parishes. But, I do believe that ten to twelve minutes can be given in every church in the country to preaching — if the man is prepared.

Well, what shall we talk about? What shall we say?

In our diocese we have had for many years a printed *Program of Instructions* for the Sunday Masses for each year. For a long time we were given topics, for example, the Duties of Parents toward each other, toward the children. Often it was difficult to cover all the topics. It was more sensible to pick the most important. Later we had full sermons written by the instructor in speech at the seminary. While this form was hailed with shouts of joy by many, I do not think it was good to put a complete sermon into the hands of a lazy priest; all he did was memorize it and give it off. Some lazier fellows just read the printed sermon to the people. This method killed all incentive to create good original sermons. Now we are on the verge of a better system. The printed program will

offer outlines for the separate Sundays, together with suggested treatment of the topic and illustrations. This is the best method: it helps and yet allows for originality.

But printed program or no printed program, I think the best way to know what to talk about on Sunday morning is to find out the needs of the audience and answer those needs with the teachings of Jesus Christ. Consider that the audience that comes to hear you speak is made up of many elements. You will find among them the poor, the miserable, the ignorant, the proud, the sinner and saint, the satisfied, the selfish, the discouraged, the weary, the weak in faith, the negligent, the tempted, the aimless, the despairing, the scrupulous, the lax, the confused — all keenly aware that their religion is a practical matter, a way of life. If you were to ask each of them, "What do you expect to get out of the sermon this morning?", you would find a ready answer; it would be their dominant need right then and there.

Find the dominant need by knowing what forces influence their lives, that form their way of thinking. Our people are exposed to forces that affect their minds and souls, their morals and beliefs. Know what your people are thinking about, talking about, worrying about. Imitate Saint John Chrysostom who had the habit and power of throwing himself into the minds of others, of imagining with exactness and with sympathy the circumstances of their lives — and answering the needs of those people be it consolation, inspiration, explanation, exhortation, or condemnation. He chose the doctrine of Christ that answered the specific need.

If the men in the kitchen canteen on Saturday night would talk about the needs of their people, they would preach better sermons on Sunday. Instead of asking "What shall we talk about?", suppose they said, "Just what do our people need to know the most?", then they would be on their way to some first class preaching the next morning.

Of course, as they put away the milk and the cake, the cheese and crackers, the cokes and the cookies, and trundle upstairs to bed, they must wonder what effect their preaching will have on the people. They cannot but help be interested in that! Even the unprepared priest wants his preaching to create people who live complete and perfect Catholic lives; he wants their private and public life to be perfect morally; he wants the dogmas to be translated into action, to have the Real Presence, the Redemption, the Incarnation, the Indwelling of the Holy Ghost to be realized and lived by them; he wants the family life in his parish to be centered around Christ; he hopes for more vocations; he wants daily Mass to be appreciated more. He wishes for results.

I wonder if he ever asks himself, "Why do I not get better results from my preaching?" That is the third of the most important problems of Sunday preaching.

I should like to come swiftly to the heart of the problem and say that it is traceable to a lack of *persuasive* preaching, talking that will move an audience into action. I believe you will agree that most of the time the persuasion in sermons is limited to a quick, last gasp try at the very end of the sermon. It always seems to me a little ridiculous that the people who hear a man talk about charity never are moved into action by him, moved to see Christ in everyone they meet, that those who hear a sermon on frequent Communion are not moved to be at the altar rail on Monday morning. The speaker cannot take action for granted; he must move his listeners to act.

Aristotle says that the persuasive speaker is a man of four authorities.[4] That is, he will be a persuasive speaker who shows himself to be a leader of men, or as a man having authority over this particular audience. He will have (1) authority of position, a man of experience, a man of reputation for action in the field of the speech he is making at the moment; he will have (2) authority of knowledge, showing himself wise and prudent in judgment; he will have (3) authority of character, having integrity of character, especially sincerity; he will have (4) the authority of a good attitude toward the audience; he will respect the intelligence of the audience; he will identify himself with the problems, the troubles of the listeners.

Now, the persuasive priest must be all of these; he must possess all four authorities. The priest should be most persuasive of all speakers because he can be better equipped with the four authorities than other speakers. Often he is not the most persuasive of talkers because he fails to develop his ethos, his authority.

Many a priest fails to understand that he is the Other Self of Christ, eternally selected to be officially dedicated to saving souls at least partly by preaching.

Many a priest does not develop his authority of knowledge; he reads and studies little. His knowledge is not fresh, varied, and wide; he does not meditate enough.

Some priests do not practice what they preach. They are insincere. We set up ourselves before the people in every talk as men dedicated to a life of virtue. If we are worldly, we will not persuade people to forsake the world in Lent; if we are sharp-tongued, known to be critical and un-

[4]Cf. Thomas V. Liske, *Effective Preaching,* (New York: Macmillan, 1951), pp. 236-245.

charitable in speech; if we are not fervent in prayer, if we hurry through the public prayers, we cannot persuade people to pray with devotion; if we are quick and irreverent in saying Mass, we cannot move the people to love the Mass. If we wish to move the people to have courage and fortitude, we will never do so, unless we suffer the ills of life with bravery for the love of God. The sincerity of the life of the good priest will flow over into his preaching.

Some priests do not have the last authority; they consider preaching a bore, a tiresome task to be avoided if possible. They do not move with enthusiasm and speak with force.

Not only is the priestly speaker often an unpersuasive person in himself, but he will not try to use the technique of persuasion, namely, set the emotions of his audience into action by the use of suggestion. The same priest who is unpersuasive in the pulpit will fall prey to all the suggestion in the ads he reads and sees in magazines, on billboards, on television and yet never try to use the same techniques in his sermons.

Suggestion operates in speaking just as it does in advertising: the idea is planted in the mind of the listener, the idea bestirs or sets in motion the passion which begets action. The priest who would be persuasive must learn to create suggestive words. Most of all he must dramatize the abstract ideas. Every teacher knows that the mere presenting of an abstract idea is scarcely ever sufficient to communicate the idea. We speak of the mercy of God, being sorry for sin, speak of purity, justice, charity — all in the abstract. Our Lord never spoke of any abstract idea without casting it in concrete, moving form. To dramatize an idea is not difficult; it means communicating an idea by action that is definite, concrete, and designed to work on the feelings or emotions of an audience.

We will never have results from our preaching until we make every sermon a persuasive one from beginning to end; a persuasive priest who has all four of the authorities, having a definite, desired response in mind, setting up the apparatus that will set the emotions in action by the use of suggestion, and the dramatization of the main idea.

I look forward to the time when on every Saturday night in all the rectories all over the country there will not be a single priest sitting at the kitchen table asking, "How am I going to get the time to think up a sermon? What will I preach about? Will I get results?"

Select Bibliography for Speech and Homiletics

The books listed below were on exhibit at the charter convention, and were chosen as a group of practical and easily obtainable reference works and manuals for seminary teachers of speech and homiletics. The comments after each title represent editorial opinion based on personal experience with the volumes, and are not the comments of the publishers. [ED.]

ALLGEIER, JOSEPH L., "Canonical Obligation of Preaching in Parish Churches," *(Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1949).* Now out of print. The title of this doctoral dissertation, which is no doubt among the holdings in the Canon Law section of most seminaries, is enough to indicate its usefulness in the introductory lectures of the course in general homiletics.

ANDERSON, VIRGIL A., "Training the Speaking Voice," *(New York: Oxford University Press, 1942).* This volume can do yeoman service as a general explanation of the characteristics of good voice and diction, although it does not go into detailed treatment of particular problems as do some of the other works listed in these pages.

ARISTOTLE, "Rhetoric," ed. by Lane Cooper, *(New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1937).* Aristotle's "Art of Rhetoric" is, of course, one of the foundation stones of the perennial rhetoric, and has had a profound influence on rhetorical history and even on modern day rhetorical thinking. The principles laid down in the first book are essential in any study of the perennial rhetoric as the framework of homiletic theory. The second book is a classic analysis of human passions. The volume is indispensable.

ATKINSON, O'BRIEN, "How to Make Us Want Your Sermon," *(New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1942).* Almost out of print. This book is both a masterpiece of self-analysis by a member of the average Sunday congregation and one of the most readable works in homiletic literature. It is a delightful as well as penetrating study of our preaching "from the viewpoint of the consumer," who, in this instance, is an advertising man. The work will be of service in many parts of the course in general homiletics, and perhaps most of all in the study of audience analysis in the tract on invention.

AUGUSTINE, SAINT, "Christian Instruction," *(New York: Cima Publishing Company, 1947).* Fathers of the Church Series. This was the first homiletic treatise, the fourth book of the *De Doctrina Christiana* especially seeking to bring over to the service of Christian revelation the art of rhetoric developed by the Greeks and Romans. There are many quotable passages in the fourth book which can be used effectively in the course in general homiletics, and the treatment of the

three levels of style will throw much light on the adaptation of this feature of the perennial rhetoric to preaching.

BAXTER, BATSELL BARRETT, "Heart of the Yale Lectures," *(New York: Macmillan, 1947)*. The Yale lectures on preaching have long been the classic contribution of Protestant ministers to the theory of preaching. They are often quoted in the Catholic homiletic literature of several decades ago. Baxter's volume gives a compendious analysis of their content.

BENARD, EDMOND D., "The Appeal to the Emotions in Preaching," *(Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1944)*. Out of print. This brochure of 46 pages gives a clear and sound statement of the philosophical basis of the emotional appeal in preaching, and is a prime example of the union of the perennial rhetoric with scholastic philosophy. It can well be made the basis of the treatment of "pathos" in homiletic invention.

BERRY AND EISENSON, "Speech Disorders," *(New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956)*. This is a large book and a very thorough treatment of all types of speech disorders, organic and functional, and as such makes a rather complete reference work for the teacher in these matters. Although many chapters deal with speech defects which will hardly be in question in seminaries, chapters 8, 9, and 10, on voice and articulation, are quite pertinent to seminary problems.

BORDEN, RICHARD C., "Public Speaking As Listeners Like It," *(New York: Harpers, 1935)*. The heart of this brochure is a type of speech outline which is simplicity itself. While it is much limited by this very simplicity, the booklet does make a good reading assignment for seminarians being introduced to homiletic arrangement.

BOYLE, PATRICK, C.M., "Instructions On Preaching, *(New York: Benziger, 1902)*. Although this little book has long been out of print, there are many copies still in seminary libraries. It consists of translations of some of the classic little treatises on homiletic theory, and is especially valuable for its inclusion of the letter of Saint Francis de Sales on preaching and the method of preaching recommended by Saint Vincent de Paul.

BREMBECK AND HOWELL, "Persuasion" *(Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1952)*. This volume deserves a place on a reference shelf as an outstanding example of the contribution that is being made in our own day to the perennial rhetoric by writers strongly influenced by psychological and experimental studies.

BRIGANCE, WILLIAM N., "Speech Composition," 2nd ed., *(New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953)*. This is one of the very best books on speech composition now published. It leaves out the detailed treatment of grammar and punctuation which slows up other texts and perhaps ought to be presupposed in any homiletics course, and it leaves out also the lengthy references to other studies which might add only the appearance of erudition. What remains is a straight-forward presentation of the essential steps in preparing a speech. With some adaptation, this theory of general public speaking can be a very helpful contribution to the course in general homiletics.

BRIGANCE AND HENDERSON, "Drill Manual for Improving Speech," 3rd ed., *(New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1945)*. Out of print. This is a good general text on articulation and voice. It is not as detailed and scientifically complete as some texts listed below, but, by the same token, it is not as forbidding for the general use of students. A good text for a short course intended to bring careful articulation to the attention of the seminarians and help them overcome general carelessness of diction.

BROADUS, "On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons," *(New York: Harper)*. The many publication dates and long list of new editions of this Protestant

classic, frequently referred to in earlier Catholic homiletic literature and sometimes even adopted as a textbook in Catholic seminaries, is evidence enough of the place it merits on any reference shelf.

BRODNITZ, FRIEDRICH S., "Keep Your Voice Healthy," *(New York: Harper, 1953).* Written by a well-known oto-laryngologist, this is an entertaining and informative arm-chair discussion of voice disorders and what to do about them. There is much helpful information on pitch and register, and much that appears in no other book about caring for the voice under such conditions as the dry air that prevails within institutions in winter time, avoiding colds or getting over them as soon as possible, etc. Should be in the homiletics professor's collection and on the seminary reference shelf. Not a textbook, but a good source of note-material to supplement the textbook.

CICERO, "Brutus, De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, De Oratore, Orator, Topica," *(Harvard: Loeb Classical Series).* Here is the depository of much that is of lasting value in the perennial rhetoric. Read these classics as many times as you will, there is always something new to be learned from them.

"The Catechism of the Council of Trent," trans. and ed. by MCHUGH AND CALLAN, O.P., *(New York: Joseph Wagner).* Still unique for its supremely authoritative and comprehensive explanation of what a pastor should preach to his people and how he should preach it, this most outstanding of sermon manuals has lost none of its original value in sermon preparation. After the Bible itself, it is hard to think of another work which would stand higher on a list of sources of material.

"The Church Teaches": Documents of the Church in English Translation, trans. and ed. by Jesuit Fathers of St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas, *(St. Louis: Herder, 1955).* Like the Catechism of the Council of Trent, although not intended in a special way for preaching, this collection supplies the preacher with authentic documentation on the doctrines he preaches. It enables him to listen again to the voice of the Church even while he is preparing his sermons on her teachings.

DONLAN, JOHN, "The Art of Reading Aloud," *(New York: Harper, 1956).* In training student preachers for the oral interpretation of Scriptural passages, this work in general literary interpretation can be of great value. The principles so well explained in this work can also be invoked in some aspects of sermon delivery, to break the habits of monotony or pitch-pattern, etc.

EUDES, SAINT JOHN, "The Priest: His Dignity and Obligations," *(New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1947).* Part II of this volume, from p. 73 to p. 123, contains the Saint's treatise on "The Apostolic Preacher." Besides its many inspiring and practical bits of advice to preachers, it is of particular interest as a commentary on the Letter of Saint Francis de Sales on Preaching (see Boyle above), showing, as does Saint Vincent's Method (ibid.), how all-pervasive in the seventeenth century were the homiletic counsels of the Bishop of Geneva who has been called "master and restorer of sacred eloquence."

FAIRBANKS, GRANT, "Voice and Articulation Drillbook," *(New York: Harper, 1940).* For general work in correcting common articulation and voice defects, this is perhaps the best book in print. The first part of the text gives a short and very lucid treatment of phonetic symbols, which is itself sufficient to sharpen the attention of seminarians to their own articulation. The rest of the text discusses individual sounds, and such vocal elements as pitch, time, phrasing, etc. The outstanding quality of the volume is its practicality, and its no-nonsense approach. It makes use of the best of modern research in speech correction and avoids all the mystic terms and panaceas that still linger in some speech texts as relics of the elocutionary era. An ideal textbook for a source in articulation and voice.

Please mention these proceedings when ordering books.

FENELON, "Dialogues On Eloquence," ed. Wilbur S. Howell, *(Princeton: P. University Press, 1951).* This is an absolute must for every professor of homiletics and, for that matter, for any student preacher who takes his work seriously. Fenelon's ideas on sermon preparation, on extemporaneous delivery, on style, and on sermon content, are peculiarly timely. No wonder that the great Bishop Dupanloup once said that if homiletics textbooks and the professors who teach them had based themselves on Fenelon's principles it would have been a giant stride forward.

GREGORY THE GREAT, SAINT, "Pastoral Care," *(Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1950).* The very direct and unsophisticated analysis of all kinds of listeners which Aristotle gives in the Second Book of his Rhetoric has its counterpart in homiletic tradition in the third part of this bishops' manual of the Middle Ages. The chapters may easily be used as pointers for sermons to particular audiences, and at the very least are useful examples of audience analysis when teaching homiletic invention.

HUMBERT OF ROMANS, "Treatise On Preaching," *(Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1951).* Without being a technical treatise on homiletic theory, this work from the thirteenth century is filled with wise observations on the whole life and activity of the preacher.

KENYON, JOHN S., "American Pronunciation," 10th ed. *(Ann Arbor: George Wahr, 1951).* This is an authoritative, thorough, and scientific discussion of American pronunciation. It puts articulation work on a rational basis, exploding the very misleading nostrums about "sounding your D's and T's" etc. The discussion is clear and interesting, and even if the closeness of attention which is demanded of the reader at every point makes the book a challenge, the rewards of concentrating on it fully are in proportion to the effort. Any professor intending to work seriously on articulation, and any student preacher for whom no pains are too great for his own improvement, should find exactly what he has been looking for in this text.

KENYON AND KNOTT, "A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English," 2nd ed, *(Springfield, Mass.: Merriam Co., 1953).* In this dictionary only the phonetic spelling and correct pronunciation of each word are given, without definitions or usage. Especially when one has given himself a thorough background in the scientific principles explained in Kenyon's *American Pronunciation* (see immediately above), this work becomes extremely useful and authoritative.

KNOX, RONALD A., "The Epistles and Gospels for Sunday and Holydays," *(New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956).* Having in one slim volume the Scriptural periscopes for the year, with the thought-provoking commentaries of Monsignor Knox following each of them, is a great advantage for the student preacher, or, for that matter, for the priest in the actual ministry. Even when the subject designated for the Sunday sermon is not based upon the proper of the day, a meditative reading of these excerpts and commentaries is a piece of "occasion analysis" which will often suggest a tie-in with the designated subject.

LEE, CHARLOTTE, "Oral Interpretation," *(Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1952).* This is one of the outstanding works in general oral interpretation, and, with adaptation, can be a useful reference work in courses on the public reading of Scriptural passages.

LISKE, THOMAS, "Effective Preaching," *(New York: Macmillan, 1951).* Of the texts now used in homiletics courses in our seminaries, this one by Father Liske is one of the most popular. When writing it, the author did not only have recourse to the publications of recent research in the contemporary speech field, but had behind him over two decades of experience teaching in Quigley Prepa-

ratory Seminary, Chicago, and preaching regularly in the parishes to which he had been assigned.

McBURNEY AND WRAGE, "The Art of Good Speech," *(New York: Prentice-Hall, 1953).* This is one of the best-sellers in the contemporary field of public-speaking textbooks, and for that reason offers an opportunity for comparison of the contents of the public speaking course with the contents of courses in homiletics.

McVANN, JAMES A., C.S.P., "The Canon Law of Sermon Preaching," *(New York: Paulist Press, 1940).* In this doctoral dissertation, Father McVann traces the development of ecclesiasticial legislation regarding preaching from the earliest times up to the modern Code of Canon Law. The reader who studies the pronouncements of Councils and Popes as they evolve legislation forms a sound understanding of what the mind of the Church is concerning the preaching to be offered in our Catholics pulpits. This work, now out of print, is one of the greatest value in the course in general homiletics.

MISSETT, LUKE, C.P., "The Pews Talk Back," *(Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1946).* This booklet is a collection of essays on various aspects of sermon composition and delivery, written by one whose life-work has been preaching and teaching others how to preach. The completely practical and non-technical approach, together with the many illustrative anecdotes, make this the kind of booklet that will appeal to priests who want to refresh their homiletic ideals without going back to the ponderous textbooks.

MINNICK, WAYNE, "Art of Persuasion," *(Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1958).* Like McBurney-Wrage, listed above, this work on persuasion is highly useful to those in homiletics courses by providing them with what the secular speech field has to say on matters which are of common interest both to public speaking and to preaching.

MONROE, ALAN H., "Principles and Types of Speech," 4th ed., *(Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1955).* Among the many good features of this very successful textbook on public speaking is its teaching on speech arrangement. The "motivated sequence," which is so much the heart of the book, can easily be adapted to homiletic arrangement, especially for moral sermons.

NEMOY-DAVIS, "Correction of Defective Consonant Sounds," *(Magnolia, Mass.: Expression Co., 1954).* Although this book is designed for work with children, it may deserve a place on the reference shelf of those who work with the minor articulatory problems of student preachers because of the very detailed and practical exercises it suggests for overcoming each type of problem. Once he has studied the principles and theory of the exercises in this volume, the instructor can easily select other sentences and paragraphs to substitute for the exercises themselves.

OLIVER, ROBERT T., "Psychology of Persuasive Speech," 2nd ed,. *(New York: Longmans, 1957).* Another work of the public speaking field which is grist for the mill of the homiletics professor or the student preacher.

PHILLIPS, ARTHUR E., "Effective Speaking," rev. ed., *(Chicago: Newton Co., 1938).* This work, which first appeared in 1908, was one of the landmarks of the early development of the modern field of speech. Many of the concepts and terms it introduced have found their way into the books which have come after it. Its clear statement of principles still repays careful reading.

PLATO, "Dialogues," (Phaedrus, Ion, Gorgias, Symposium, parts of Republic and Laws), ed. Lane Cooper, *(Ithaca: Cornell U. Press, 1938).* This volume brings together the dialogues in which Plato makes his contribution to rhetorical theory. The philosophic or truth-theory of rhetoric was Plato's main proposition, and

profoundly influenced Aristotle's Rhetoric. Since this view is, of course, basic to homiletic theory, a discussion of Plato's dialogues makes a good contribution to a seminar in the background of homiletic theory. Lane Cooper's collection does the service of offering all the pertinent dialogues in a single collection.

QUINTILIAN, "Institutio Oratoria," *(Harvard: Loeb Classical Series).* Quintilian's works, gathered in four volumes in this series, need no word of commendation. Summing up all who went before him and contributing to most who came after him, Quintilian is the great spokesman for the perennial rhetoric.

ROCK, AUGUSTINE, O.P., "Unless They Be Sent," *(Published in 1953, now distributed by Priory Press, Dubuque, Iowa).* This is a penetrating and scholarly discussion of the theology of preaching which makes a highly useful reference work for the introductory lectures in a course in general homiletics. In the author's own words: "This work is not directly concerned with the art of preaching; it is an attempt to analyze the theological concept of the preaching office in such a way as to shed some light on what preaching is and precisely what it is expected to do."

SARETT AND FOSTER, "Basic Principles of Speech," *(Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1946).* This book is almost equally divided into two sections on composition and delivery. The section on delivery is excellent, giving a treatment of bodily action, vocal variety, and other elements of good delivery perhaps unequalled in comparative works in the field. Some readers who compare the 1946 edition with the more recent posthumous revision may find the former more desirable for its conciseness.

SHARP, JOHN K., "Next Sunday's Sermon," *(Philadelphia: Dolphin Press, 1936).* Together with Father Liske's "Effective Preaching," this text is one of the most widely used in seminaries at the present time. When it appeared two decades ago it superseded the works that went before it, and even today it repays close study.

SHARP, JOHN K., "Our Preaching," *(Philadelphia: Dolphin Press, 1936).* The author says in his preface to this work that it is a book on special homiletics, the application to specific materials and specific situations of the principles of general homiletics. It contains a wealth of scholarly information, much of it unobtainable elsewhere in English.

TOAL, M. F., "The Sunday Sermons of the Great Fathers," 4 vols., *(Chicago: Regnery, 1958).* This set, of which the first two volumes have already appeared, with two more in preparation, brings together in a convenient format the thoughts of the Fathers of the Church on the texts of the Sunday propers. The Scriptural pericopes for each Sunday are given, then the parallel passages, followed by a translation of the corresponding section of the *Catena Aurea* of Saint Thomas, and finally extended passages from the homilies and sermons of the Fathers. Certainly "multum in parvo." The set comes in a hand edition and a deluxe edition.

THOMAS, C. K., "Phonetics of American English," *(New York: Ronald Press, 1947).* This book covers much the same ground as Kenyon's "American Pronunciation," listed above, but is perhaps less forbidding in typography and style. It does not have Kenyon's advantage of an accompanying pronouncing dictionary. Discussion of regional and dialectal pronunciations is quite good.

THOMPSON, NEWTON, "Harmony of the Gospels," *(St. Louis: Herder, 1942).* The usefulness of a Gospel harmony as an aid to sermon preparation is obvious. Among the harmonies, this is a good one.

THOMPSON AND STOCK, "Complete Concordance to the Bible," *(St. Louis: Herder, 1945).* Presently a standard work of its kind. A verbal concordance such as this would seem indispensable on the reference shelf, and its skillful use would seem to be part of the instruction in the tract on invention.

THONSSEN, LESTER, "Selected Readings In Rhetoric and Public Speaking," *(New York: H. W. Wilson, 1942).* In a little more than three hundred pages the com-

piler of this book has gathered lengthy excerpts from rhetorical treatises spread over the twenty-five hundred years of rhetorical tradition. While excerpts are not substitutes for the originals, many of the originals excerpted here would be difficult, if not impossible, to obtain. This collection would be of unique value to anyone wishing to make the perennial rhetoric the framework of homiletic theory. It is also an illustration of the type of anthology of homiletic theory which could easily be compiled by excerpting the major homiletic treatises since the fourth century.

Thonssen and Baird, "Speech Criticism," *(New York: Ronald Press, 1948).* As the work listed immediately above gives excerpts of treatises which expound the concepts of the perennial rhetoric, so this volume forms a commentary on them. Like the work to which it is sequel, it is of great value in a study of rhetorical tradition.

Valentine, Ferdinand, O.P., "The Art of Preaching," *(Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1942).* In spite of its title, this is not a textbook. Its basis is the accumulated wisdom drawn from years of experience in the pulpit. Part Two, "Types of Preaching," offers some suggestions, such as those on methods of conducting group discussions on religious themes, which are not easily found elsewhere.

Van Riper, "Speech Correction," 3rd ed., *(Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall 1954).* The chapters on articulation and voice which form the larger part of this book are excellent. The section on stuttering is also very good, although hardly of practical value in homiletics courses. A careful reading of it should, however, be of help to speech teachers when an occasional mild stutterer appears in the seminary or religious community.

Vaughan, Kenelm, "Divine Armory of Holy Scripture," *(St. Louis: Herder, 1943).* While Thompson-Stock, listed above, is standard as a verbal concordance, Vaughan is standard as a topical concordance. It would seem to be just as indispensable in sermon preparation, since the two types of concordance fill two distinct needs.

Veuillot, Pierre, "The Catholic Priesthood," *(Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1958).* This book not only contains two volumes in one, but it fulfills two very worthwhile purposes for priests. One service is that it collects for them all papal documents bearing on the priestly vocation, from Pope Pius X to Pius XII. This, of course, makes it a mine of material for meditation and for those who preach clergy retreats and recollections. Another service, more to the point in this list of books, is that it brings together all the recent papal pronouncements on preaching. In this way it is a primary reference work for the norms of sermon content in the course on homiletic invention.

Winans, James A., "Speech Making," *(New York: Appleton-Century, 1938).* Like Phillips, listed above, this is one of the pioneers of the modern speech field which is still worth studying.

Wise, Claude Merton, "Applied Phonetics," *(Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1957).* This is the most recent and comprehensive work of its kind, dealing not only with the phonetics of American English in the greatest detail, but with the pronunciation of many modern languages. The treatment of the American dialects and sub-standard forms of usage is exhaustive and unique. An essential reference work for teaching articulation and diction.

Please mention these proceedings when ordering books.